Submitted to the Annals of Applied Probability

arXiv:1301.1762v2 [math.PR] 13 Jan 2013

HIGHER ORDER MARKOV RANDOM FIELDS FOR INDEPENDENT SETS

By David A. Goldberg

Georgia Institute of Technology

We consider higher order Markov random fields to study independent sets in regular graphs of large girth (i.e. Bethe lattice, Cayley tree). We give sufficient conditions for a second-order homogenous isotropic Markov random field to exhibit long-range boundary independence (i.e. decay of correlations, unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure), and give both necessary and sufficient conditions when the relevant clique potentials of the corresponding Gibbs measure satisfy a log-convexity assumption. We gain further insight into this characterization by interpreting our model as a multi-dimensional perturbation of the hardcore model, and (under a convexity assumption) give a simple polyhedral characterization for those perturbations (around the well-studied critical activity of the hardcore model) which maintain long-range boundary independence. After identifying several features of this polyhedron, we also characterize (again as a polyhedral set) how one can change the occupancy probabilities through such a perturbation. We then use linear programming to analyze the properties of this set of attainable probabilities, showing that although one cannot acheive denser independent sets, it is possible to optimize the number of excluded nodes which are adjacent to no included nodes.

1. Introduction. Recently, there has been a significant interest in combining ideas from probability, computer science, physics, statistics, and operations research, to shed light on the structure and complexity of combinatorial optimization, counting, and sampling problems [83],[72],[1],[103]. Some of the most well-studied such problems involve the independent sets (i.s.) of a graph. Consider an undirected graph G, which consists of a set of nodes V and edges E, where each edge $e \in E$ is of the form (v_i, v_j) for some $v_i, v_j \in V$. Then the i.s. of G, $\mathcal{I}(G)$, are defined to be the subsets S of V with no internal edges; i.e. a set $S \in 2^V$ is an i.s. iff for all pairs of nodes $v_i, v_j \in S$, $(v_i, v_j) \notin E$. I.s. arise in many applications, ranging from the study of communication networks [102] to computer vision [16], economics [29], and biology [63]; and the problem of finding the maximum i.s. of a graph was one of the original NP-Complete problems identified in Garey and Johnson's classical text on computational intractibility [88]. There are a wealth of results about the complexity and (in)approximability of counting, sampling, and optimizing i.s. under various restrictions. We make no attempt to survey that literature here, instead focusing only on the results most relevant to our own investigations.

1.1. *Markov random fields and Gibbs measures.* Markov random fields (M.r.f.), and the associated Gibbs measures, have proven to be a powerful framework for studying these (and related) questions. Recall that a collection of r.v.s $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ defines a binary M.r.f. if the following is true [8],[79]. First, X_i has support on $\{0, 1\}$ for all i. Second, to each r.v. X_i, we can associate a subset N_i of the indices $\{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus i$ (called the neighborhood of X_i), such that for any binary

---

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 60K35

Keywords and phrases: independent set, Markov random field, Gibbs measure, phase transition, hardcore model

n-dimensional vector $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbb{P}\big(\bigcap_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\setminus i}\{X_j=\mathbf{x}_j\}\big)>0$ implies

$$\mathbb{P}\big(X_i=1|\bigcap_{j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}\setminus i}\{X_j=\mathbf{x}_j\}\big)=\mathbb{P}\big(X_i=1|\bigcap_{j\in N_i}\{X_j=\mathbf{x}_j\}\big).$$

In words, the conditional probability that X_i takes a given value if we condition on all other r.v.s is the same as the corresponding conditional probability if we only condition on the r.v.s belonging to the neighborhood of X_i. We further suppose that the neighborhood relation is symmetric, i.e. $i\in N_j$ iff $j\in N_i$. In this case, note that the neighborhood structure of the M.r.f. defines an undirected graph, in which there is a node for each variable, and two nodes are adjacent iff they are neighbors. Of course, one can view any collection of r.v.s as a trivial M.r.f. by setting $N_i=\{1,\ldots,n\}\setminus i$ for all i. However, many interesting probabilistic models enjoy a non-trivial conditional independence structure, e.g. the class of graphical models and their applications to fields ranging from computer vision to biology [117].

A closely related concept is that of the Gibbs measure. Recall that the cliques of a graph G, $\mathcal{C}(G)$, are defined to be the subsets S of V with all internal edges present; i.e. a set $S\in 2^V$ is a clique iff for all pairs of distinct nodes $v_i,v_j\in S$, $(v_i,v_j)\in E$. For each clique $C\in\mathcal{C}(G)$, we define a non-negative function π_C (called the clique potential), which takes as input binary values for all the nodes belonging to C, and outputs a non-negative real number. For a graph G, let $|G|$ denote the number of nodes. For a binary $|G|$-dimensional vector $\mathbf{x}$ and clique $C\in\mathcal{C}(G)$, let $\mathbf{x}_C$ denote the projection of the vector $\mathbf{x}$ onto the indices of nodes present in the clique C. Then given a graph G, a binary r.v. X_i associated to each node $v_i\in V$, and a potential function π_C for each clique $C\in\mathcal{C}(G)$, we define the associated binary Gibbs measure $\mathbb{P}$ on the r.v.s $X_1,\ldots,X_n$ as follows. For every binary $|G|$-dimensional vector $\mathbf{x}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\bigcap_{i=1}^{|G|}\{X_i=\mathbf{x}_i\}\big)=\Big(\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\{0,1\}^{|G|}}\prod_{C\in\mathcal{C}(G)}\pi_C(\mathbf{x}_C)\Big)^{-1}\prod_{C\in\mathcal{C}(G)}\pi_C(\mathbf{x}_C).$$

There is a deep connection between M.r.f. and Gibbs measures. In particular, under certain regularity conditions, the joint distribution of $X_1,\ldots,X_n$ is given by a M.r.f. iff the joint distribution of $X_1,\ldots,X_n$ is a Gibbs measure, whose underlying graph is defined by the neighborhood structure of the given M.r.f. The celebrated Hammersley-Clifford Theorem, as well as several follow-up works, make these regularity conditions explicit [58],[56],[8],[54].

As M.r.f. and Gibbs measures provide an elegant way to describe a rich family of non-trivial correlation structures on collections of r.v.s, the framework of M.r.f. and Gibbs measures has had a significant impact on many fields, including statistics, physics, computer vision, geology, biology, combinatorial optimization, and operations research [117], [8], [100] [42], [79], [91], [127], [121], [65].

1.2. *Applications of M.r.f. to physics and combinatorial optimization.* We now make the connection between certain models in physics and combinatorial optimization (i.s. in particular) to Gibbs measures (and their associated normalizing constants) more explicit. In his seminal Ph.D. thesis [37], Ernst Ising defined the so-called Ising model, to study the properties of particle systems which exhibit pairwise attraction and repulsion. Namely, suppose one has a set of particles $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ arranged on an underlying graphical structure G, where each particle i has a "spin" $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i\in\{0,1\}$. In the limit, as the spins become fully repulsive / anti-ferromagnetic, the probability measure associated with this model (in equilibrium) is a Gibbs measure with support on spin configurations $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ s.t. the set of particles receiving spin 1 corresponds to an i.s. of G. Furthermore, for any i.s. $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{I}(G)$, the probability that the spins are in the configuration corresponding to $\mathcal{I}$ equals $\lambda^{|\mathcal{I}|}(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{I}(G)} \lambda^{|S|})^{-1}$, where λ is a non-negative parameter whose logarithm has an interpretation in terms of the "temperature" of the system, and $|S|$ denotes the cardinality of S. This system is called the *hardcore model.* Note that to further quantify this probability, one must compute the relevant normalizing constant / partition function (p.f.), which equals $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{I}(G)} \lambda^{|S|}$. When $\lambda = 1$, computing the p.f. is equivalent to counting the number of i.s. in G (a $\#P$-Complete problem [121]); as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, all the probability mass gets put on the largest i.s., and computing the p.f. is analagous to finding the cardinality of the maximum i.s.

Such anti-ferromagnetic M.r.f. models have a rich history in the physics literature. Models in which G is a lattice were studied in [35],[18],[108],[109],[110],[53],[99],[96],[6]. This work was extended to the three-regular tree by L.K. Runnels in [100], and the general regular tree (i.e. Cayley tree with general co-ordination number) in [24]. In these early works, it was observed that the underlying models underwent a *phase transition* as one varied λ. As this concept will be central to the rest of the paper, we now make this more precise. For a fixed graph G and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $\mathbb{P}_{\lambda,G}$ denote the Gibbs measure, on the i.s. of G, which assigns i.s. $\mathcal{I}$ probability $\lambda^{|\mathcal{I}|}\big(\sum_{S\in\mathcal{I}(G)} \lambda^{|S|}\big)^{-1}$. Let T_d denote the rooted (at r) depth-d tree in which all non-leaf nodes have degree Δ ; and $\mathbb{P}_{\lambda,T_d}(r \in \mathcal{I})$ the probability that the root is included in the corresponding random i.s. Then for each $\Delta \geq 3$, there exists a critical actvity $\lambda_\Delta \stackrel{\Delta}{=} (\Delta - 1)^{\Delta-1}(\Delta - 2)^{-\Delta}$ s.t. for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_\Delta]$ (i.e. uniqueness / long-range boundary independence regime), $\lim_{d\rightarrow\infty} \mathbb{P}_{\lambda,T_d}(r \in \mathcal{I})$ exists; for all $\lambda > \lambda_\Delta$, the limit does not exist. In particular, for $\lambda \leq \lambda_\Delta$, there is an asymptotic independence on the boundary condition at the base of the tree; for $\lambda > \lambda_\Delta$, there is a non-vanishing dependence on this boundary condition [66]. It is well-known that the existence of this limit can also be phrased in terms of whether or not an appropriate infinite tree has a unique translation-invariant Gibbs measure [125],[34],[17],[120],[2],[119],[55].

More recently, it has been shown that this same phase transition also corresponds to the point at which certain Markov chains for sampling from the i.s. of a graph of maximum degree Δ switch from mixing in polynomial time to mixing in exponential time [87]. Furthermore, it was shown in [121] that for all $\lambda \leq \lambda_\Delta$, the problem of computing $\sum_{S\in\mathcal{I}(G)} \lambda^{|S|}$ admits a Fully Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme (FPTAS) for all graphs of maximum degree Δ. Combined with the results of [106],[107],[43], which show that no such FPTAS exists for $\lambda > \lambda_\Delta$ unless certain complexity classes collapse (i.e. $NP = RP$), as well as several recent related works [3],[105],[78],[19],[124], this shows that the aforementioned phase transition has deep connections to computational complexity.

We note that questions regarding the existence of such phase transitions also arise in the context of various other applications, e.g. fitting correlation structures in computer vision models [111], since systems exhibiting long-range boundary dependence may be undesirable from a modeling and simulation perspective.

1.3. *Higher order M.r.f..* Note that in all of the aforementioned works using M.r.f. to study the i.s. of a graph G, non-trivial clique potentials were given only to cliques of size 1 (individual nodes) and 2 (edges), i.e. these were M.r.f. limited to nearest-neighbor (pairwise) interactions. In the language of M.r.f., this corresponds to letting the neighborhood N_i of the binary variable X_i (set to 1 if node v_i is included in the i.s.) be the set of neighbors of node v_i in G, so that the cliques of the graph associated with the neighborhood system of the M.r.f. are the same as the cliques of the underlying graph G (supposing that G is triangle-free). However, such measures are not capturing the full power of M.r.f. In particular, the neighborhood N_i of X_i can be any set of indices (not just those corresponding to edges in the underlying graph G), so long as all the clique potential functions evaluate to 0 on any configurations which assign the value 1 to two nodes which are adjacent in G. For a graph G and node v, let $N_d(v)$ denote the set of all nodes at graph-theoretic distance exactly d from v, $N_{\leq d}(v) \triangleq \bigcup\limits_{k \leq d} N_k(v)$ the subgraph induced by those nodes at graph-theoretic distance at most d, and $N_{\geq d}(v) \triangleq \bigcup\limits_{k \geq d} N_k(v)$ the subgraph induced by those nodes at graph-theoretic distance at least d. We use $N(v)$ as shorthand for $N_1(v)$, the set of neighbors of v. To be consistent with the literature [111], let us say that a M.r.f. is of the k-th order w.r.t. G if the r.v. X_i associated with node v_i of G has neighborhood N_i equal to the set of indices of nodes belonging to $N_{\leq k}(v_i) \setminus v_i$. The use of such higher order M.r.f. has recently been successful in modeling more complicated spatial dependencies in the computer vision community [93],[42],[111],[70],[71],[69],[98],[30],[74],[77],[86]. As the set of i.s. of a graph is known to exhibit complicated dependencies [23], and (as described previously) first-order binary M.r.f. have known limitations (e.g. the aforementioned phase transition) for understanding these dependencies [111], we pose the following question:

Question 1. *What is the power of higher order M.r.f. for understanding the i.s. of graphs?*

We will further restrict our analysis to Δ-regular graphs of large girth (i.e. length of the smallest cycle), as such graphs have a simple local description (i.e. Δ-regular tree), yet can exhibit complicated global behavior, and thus make an excellent testing ground for studying such questions. Furthermore, such graphs are often extremal w.r.t. properties of i.s. [121], and are "typical" of all regular graphs in an appropriate sense, i.e. a Δ-regular graph selected uniformly at random from all Δ-regular graphs looks locally like a Δ-regular graph of large girth [122]. Note that if G is a Δ-regular graph of girth at least $k+1$, and k is even, the maximal cliques (i.e. cliques not properly contained in other cliques) of the associated k-th order M.r.f. are exactly sets of the form $N_{\leq \frac{k}{2}}(v_i)$, i.e. all the depth-$\frac{k}{2}$ neighborhoods. Furthermore, these sets are all Δ-regular trees.

Let us also suppose that the clique potential functions are homogenous and isotropic (h.i.). More formally, note that the configuration induced on $N_{\leq \frac{k}{2}}(v_i)$ by a binary vector $\mathbf{x}$ may be viewed as a rooted (at v_i), depth-$\frac{k}{2}$, 0/1 labeled Δ-regular tree. Then we say that the associated set of clique potentials is h.i. if for all i, j (where i may equal j), and any binary $|G|$-dimensional vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$, $\pi_{N_{\leq \frac{k}{2}}(v_i)}(\mathbf{x}_{N_{\leq \frac{k}{2}}(v_i)}) = \pi_{N_{\leq \frac{k}{2}}(v_j)}(\mathbf{y}_{N_{\leq \frac{k}{2}}(v_j)})$ if the rooted 0/1 labeled tree which $\mathbf{x}$ induces on $N_{\leq \frac{k}{2}}(v_i)$ is isomorphic to the rooted 0/1 labeled tree which $\mathbf{y}$ induces on $N_{\leq \frac{k}{2}}(v_j)$. In this case, for any fixed k and Δ, the associated M.r.f. has a finite-size description, i.e. an assignment of non-negative real numbers to isomorphism classes of depth-$\frac{k}{2}$ rooted 0/1 labeled Δ-regular trees. Then we may ask the following refinement of Question 1:

Question 2. *What is the power of constant-order h.i.M.r.f. for understanding the i.s. of constant-degree regular graphs of large constant girth?*

Note that "constant-order", "constant-degree", and "large constant girth" should be interpreted as being fixed (albeit possibly very large) constants, independent of the overall size of the underlying graph, which is diverging to infinity. In analogy with the work on first-order M.r.f. for i.s., a closely related question is:

QUESTION 3. *What phase transitions are associated with constant-order h.i.M.r.f. defined on the i.s. of constant-degree regular graphs of large constant girth, and what kinds of distributions on the i.s. can be induced by h.i.M.r.f. in the associated uniqueness regime?*

We note that some special cases of higher order h.i.M.r.f. have already been considered for studying i.s. and generalizations of the hardcore model. This includes work in the statistical physics community which incorporates next-nearest-neighbor and/or competing interactions [39],[75],[115],[50],[49],[51],[52],[22],[4]; work which studies so-called kinetically constrained spin models (e.g. the Kob-Andersen model) [10],[20],[94],[68],[118],[41] and geometrically constrained spin models (e.g. the Biroli-Mezard model) [9],[97],[67],[73], in which a hard density constraint forbids configurations for which a particle has more than some fixed number of occupied neighboring sites; and work on models assigning positive probability only to maximal i.s., in which every excluded node is incident to at least one included node [28], as well as related combinatorial constraints [84]. Other related work comes from the field of stochastic geometry, in which the distribution of points in space depends on the local geometry of those points [57],[33], as well as stochastic models arising in communication networks [64],[61] and other areas [15],[92]. We note that although a higher order M.r.f. can always be represented as a first-order M.r.f. on a modified graph by increasing the associated alphabet and adding auxiliary nodes [117],[62], the potentials on this modified graph may not have the same natural interpretation in terms of neighborhood configurations.

Other variants of the hardcore model have also been studied in the literature. This includes models associated with more general graph homomorphism [17], the Potts model of physics [123], and graph colorings [116],[82] - we make no attempt to survey that literature here. It also includes non-binary models, as well as models in which both nodes and edges receive labels [27],[2],[64], and various other modifications [114]. Particularly relevant are more general hyperedge models studied recently by several authors [89],[60],[36],[76],[101],[33],[112],[44], as the clique potentials associated with a higher order M.r.f. can be modeled using an appropriate set of hyperedges.

1.4. *Our contribution.* In this paper, we take a step towards answering Questions 2 and 3, by analyzing the class of second-order h.i.M.r.f. on the i.s. of constant-degree regular graphs of large constant girth (i.e. the Bethe lattice / Cayley graph). Note that if the graph is Δ-regular, then the associated clique potentials are defined by $\Delta+1$ parameters, which we denote $\lambda, \boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\Delta)$, with λ corresponding to the neighborhood configuration in which the central node is included and all neighboring nodes are excluded, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ corresponding to the neighborhood configuration in which the central node is excluded and exactly k neighbors are included. In particular, an i.s. $\mathcal{I}$ for which exactly n_0 excluded nodes are incident to 0 included nodes, n_1 excluded nodes are incident to 1 included node, ..., and n_Δ excluded nodes are incident to Δ included nodes, receives probability proportional to $\lambda^{|\mathcal{I}|}\prod_{j=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{n_j}$. Note that if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \ldots = \boldsymbol{\theta}_\Delta = 1$, or more generally there exists some fixed $\kappa, \gamma > 0$ s.t. $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j = \kappa\gamma^j$ for all j, then our model reduces to the hardcore model.

Our main results w.r.t. this model are as follows. We give sufficient conditions on $\lambda, \boldsymbol{\theta}$ for the associated Gibbs measure to exhibit long-range boundary independence, and give both necessary and sufficient conditions when the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_\Delta\}$ is log-convex. We then develop a perturbative approach to gain further insight into the geometry of this $(\Delta+1)$-dimensional space (i.e.

uniqueness regime). Let $\mathbf{1}(\mathbf{0})$ denote the (appopriately dimensioned) all ones (zeros) vector. Then we note that (after normalization) setting $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \lambda_{\Delta}^{-1}\mathbf{1}$ reduces our model to the hardcore model at the critical activity, and ask for which vectors $\mathbf{c}$ is it true that our model exhibits long-range boundary independence if we set $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \lambda_{\Delta}^{-1}\mathbf{1} + \epsilon\mathbf{c}$ for sufficiently small positive ϵ, i.e. how can we bias slightly towards (against) certain neighborhood configurations while remaining in the uniqueness regime. We give a simple polyhedral characterization for this set of vectors under a convexity assumption on $\mathbf{c}$. After identifying several features of this polyhedron, we also characterize (again as a polyhedral set) how one can change the occupancy probabilities through such a perturbation. We then use linear programming (l.p.) to analyze the properties of this set of attainable probabilities, showing that although one cannot acheive denser i.s., it is possible to optimize the number of excluded nodes which are adjacent to no included nodes.

1.5. *Outline of paper.* The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we formally define all relevant terms and state our main results. In Section 3, we rephrase the probabilities and questions of interest in terms of the relevant p.f. and associated recursions, and prove our general sufficient condition for long-range boundary independence. In Section 4, we prove our necessary and sufficient conditions for long-range boundary independence under a log-convexity assumption. In Section 5, we describe the framework for our perturbative analysis, and give a simple polyhedral characterization for the set of perturbations which exhibit long-range boundary independence. In Section 6, we characterize (again as a polyhedral set) how one can change the occupancy probabilities through such a perturbation, and use l.p. to analyze the properties of this set of attainable probabilities. In Section 8 we summarize our main results and present ideas for future research. We include a technical appendix in Section 9.

2. Main Results.

2.1. *Preliminary definitions and notations.* We now formally define the relevant Gibbs measures, which correspond to second-order h.i.M.r.f. As our primary interest will be in regular graphs of large girth, we will always have a fixed reference degree Δ, which will often be implicit. For a fixed, strictly positive $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_0, \ldots, \theta_{\Delta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{+\ (\Delta+1)}$, input graph G, node $v \in V$, and i.s. $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{I}(G)$, let

$$\phi_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G}(v,\mathcal{I}) \triangleq \begin{cases} \lambda & \text{if } |N(v)| = \Delta, v \in \mathcal{I}, \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{|N(v)\bigcap \mathcal{I}|} & \text{if } |N(v)| = \Delta, v \notin \mathcal{I}, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

$$w_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G}(\mathcal{I}) \triangleq \prod_{v \in V} \phi_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G}(v,\mathcal{I});$$

and

$$Z_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G} \triangleq \sum_{\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{I}(G)} w_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G}(\mathcal{I}).$$

Let the Gibbs measure $\mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G}$ denote the probability measure, on $\mathcal{I}(G)$, s.t. for all $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{I}(G)$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G}(\mathcal{I}) = w_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G}(\mathcal{I}) Z^{-1}_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},G}.$$

We now introduce some additional notation, to facilitate describing the above measure under various conditionings. For an i.s. $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{I}(G)$ and set of nodes $U \in 2^{V}$, let $\mathcal{I}_U$ be the inclusion/exclusion pattern (w.r.t. $\mathcal{I}$) of the nodes belonging to U. We note that when referring to boundary conditions (b.c.), e.g. conditoning on the event $\{\mathcal{I}_U = \mathbf{B}\}$, and taking associated infima and suprema, we will implicitly restrict ourselves to those b.c. with strictly positive probability.

Recall that T_d denotes the rooted (at r) depth d tree in which all non-leaf nodes have degree Δ. For an i.s. $\mathcal{I}$ of a rooted depth d tree T, let $\partial\mathcal{I} \overset{\Delta}{=} \mathcal{I}_{N_{\geq d-1}(r)}$, i.e. the b.c. induced on the bottom *two* layers of the tree. Then the main inquiry of this paper is under which conditions

$$\liminf_{d\to\infty} \inf_{\mathbf{B}} \mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},T_d}\left(r \notin \mathcal{I}, |N(r) \bigcap \mathcal{I}| = k \middle| \partial\mathcal{I} = \mathbf{B}\right) \tag{2}$$

equals

$$\limsup_{d\to\infty} \sup_{\mathbf{B}} \mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},T_d}\left(r \notin \mathcal{I}, |N(r) \bigcap \mathcal{I}| = k \middle| \partial\mathcal{I} = \mathbf{B}\right), \tag{3}$$

and what inclusion/exclusion probabilities are attainable when these limits indeed coincide, in which case we denote the relevant limit as $\mathbf{p}_k^{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, and the associated vector as $\mathbf{p}^{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. We also let $\mathbf{p}_+^{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta}} \overset{\Delta}{=} 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} \mathbf{p}_k^{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ denote the corresponding limit of the probability that the root is included.

To be consistent with the literature [55],[119], we say that the vector $(\lambda, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ admits a *unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure* on the infinite Δ-regular tree iff for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$, (2) equals (3). As all relevant quantities are unchanged if both λ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are normalized by the same positive constant, we w.l.o.g. normalize λ to equal unity, define $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \overset{\Delta}{=} \lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and state all results in terms of the analogous measure $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\gamma},T_d}$, quantities $\mathbf{p}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, $\mathbf{p}_+^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$, and question of whether $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ admits a unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure on the infinite Δ-regular tree.

2.2. *Main Results.* We now state our main results. We begin by giving a sufficient condition for uniqueness. For $k, n \in Z^+$ s.t. $n \geq k$, and a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we let $\sigma_k(\mathbf{x})$ denote the kth elementary symmetric polynomial on n variables evaluated at $\mathbf{x}$. Namely, $\sigma_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1$, and

$$\sigma_k(\mathbf{x}) \quad = \quad \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \ldots < i_k \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \mathbf{x}_{i_j} \quad = \quad \sum_{\substack{S \in 2^{\{1,\ldots,n\}} \\ |S|=k}} \prod_{i \in S} \mathbf{x}_i.$$

For example, $\sigma_2(x, y, z) = xy + xz + yz$. Also, for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{+\ (\Delta-1)}$, let

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \overset{\Delta}{=} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_{k+1}\sigma_k(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_k \sigma_k(\mathbf{x})},$$

and

$$g(\mathbf{x}) \overset{\Delta}{=} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_k \sigma_k(\mathbf{x})\right)^{-1}.$$

For two vectors $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ of the same dimension, we use the notation $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{y}$ to denote component-wise domination, i.e. $\mathbf{x}_i \geq \mathbf{y}_i$ for all i. For a scalar $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we let $f(x) \overset{\Delta}{=} f(x\mathbf{1})$, $g(x) \overset{\Delta}{=} g(x\mathbf{1})$, and note that

$$f(x) = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_{k+1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k} x^k}{\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_k \binom{\Delta-1}{k} x^k},$$

and

$$g(x) = \Big(\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_k \binom{\Delta-1}{k} x^k \Big)^{-1}.$$

Then

Theorem 1. *The system of equations (s.o.e.)*

$$x \;=\; g(y) \min_{\substack{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{R}^{+\ (\Delta-1)} \\ x\mathbf{1}\le\mathbf{z}\le y\mathbf{1}}} f^{\Delta-1}(\mathbf{z}); \tag{4}$$

$$y \;=\; g(x) \max_{\substack{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{R}^{+\ (\Delta-1)} \\ x\mathbf{1}\le\mathbf{z}\le y\mathbf{1}}} f^{\Delta-1}(\mathbf{z}); \tag{5}$$

always has at least one non-negative solution on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$. *If this solution is unique, then* $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ *admits a unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure on the infinite* Δ*-regular tree.*

We now provide necessary and sufficient conditions for uniqueness under a log-convexity assumption on $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. Recall that a strictly positive sequence $\{x_i, i = 0, \ldots, n\}$ is called log-convex iff $\frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i} \ge \frac{x_i}{x_{i-1}}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, and is called convex iff $x_{i+1} - x_i \ge x_i - x_{i-1}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$. Then

Theorem 2. *The s.o.e.*

$$x \;=\; g(y) f^{\Delta-1}(x); \tag{6}$$

$$y \;=\; g(x) f^{\Delta-1}(y); \tag{7}$$

always has at least one non-negative solution on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$. *A log-convex vector* $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ *admits a unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure on the infinite* Δ*-regular tree iff this solution is unique.*

Note that Theorem 2 reduces to the known characterization for uniqueness in the hardcore model if we set $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}$. We also note that our proof of Theorem 2 implies that the boundary condition in which all nodes on the boundary are included is "extremal" under the stated log-convexity assumption; i.e. if there is dependence on the boundary, than that particular boundary condition will induce oscillating behavior on the probability that the root is included. Several such monotonicity results appear throughout the literature, e.g. for so-called "repulsive" first-order M.r.f. [126], and fields which satisfy the well-studied positive (negative) lattice condition and related notions of positive (negative) association and the van den Berg-Kesten-Reimer (BKR) and Fortuin-Kasteleyn-Ginibre (FKG) inequalities [40],[90],[113],[14],[95],[101],[55],[112]. Although we do not pursue those connections here, it is an interesting question to further investigate the relation of these results to higher order M.r.f. for i.s.

As an explicit description of when Equations 6 - 7 have a unique non-negative solution, and which inclusion/exclusion probabilities can be attained in this way, seems difficult in general, we develop a perturbative approach to gain insight into the geometry of the uniqueness regime. Recall that in the hardcore model (in which $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}$), there is uniqueness iff $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \ge \lambda_\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{1}$. Thus $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \lambda_\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{1}$ defines the "boundary of uniqueness" in the hardcore model. We will probe the geometry of the uniqueness regime by explicitly characterizing those perturbations around $\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{1}$ in the parameter space which exhibit uniqueness.

Let us fix a vector $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{c}_\Delta)$, and for $h \in (0, \lambda_\Delta^{-1}(\max_i |\mathbf{c}_i|)^{-1})$, define $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h} \triangleq \lambda_\Delta^{-1}\mathbf{1} + h\mathbf{c}$. It follows from a simple Taylor series expansion that

Observation 1. *There exists $\epsilon_{\mathbf{c}} > 0$ s.t. for $h \in (0, \epsilon_{\mathbf{c}})$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}$ is log-convex iff $\mathbf{c}$ is convex.*

Let us say that $\mathbf{c}$ is a *direction of uniqueness* (d.u.) iff there exists $\epsilon_{\mathbf{c}} > 0$ s.t. for all $h \in (0, \epsilon_{\mathbf{c}})$, $\gamma^{\mathbf{c},h}$ admits a unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure on the infinite Δ-regular tree; and a *direction of non-uniqueness* (d.n.u.) iff there exists $\epsilon_{\mathbf{c}} > 0$ s.t. for all $h \in (0, \epsilon_{\mathbf{c}})$, $\gamma^{\mathbf{c},h}$ *does not* admit a unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure on the infinite Δ-regular tree. We now provide an explicit characterization / dichotomy theorem, classifying (almost) all convex vectors as either d.u. or d.n.u. For $j \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$, let $\Lambda_{\Delta,j} \triangleq \binom{\Delta}{j}(\Delta-2)^{-j}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\boldsymbol{\pi}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\pi}_\Delta)$ denote the vector s.t. for $j \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_j \triangleq \Lambda_{\Delta,j}\big((\Delta-2) + (6-5\Delta)j + 2(\Delta-1)j^2\big).$$

Then

Theorem 3. *A convex vector $\mathbf{c}$ is a d.u. if $\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{c} < 0$, and a d.n.u. if $\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{c} > 0$.*

In particular, the hyperplane defined by $\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0$ represents a phase transition in the "perturbation" parameter space. We note that the question of what happens at the boundary (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0$) seems to require a finer asymptotic analysis, and we leave this as an open question. As the property of convexity can be described using linear inequalities, Theorem 3 implies that the set of convex directions of uniqueness (c.d.u.) has a simple polyhedral description. In particular, let the polyhedron U equal the set of all vectors $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{c}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{c}_\Delta)$ s.t.

$$-\mathbf{c}_{k-1} + 2\mathbf{c}_k - \mathbf{c}_{k+1} \leq 0\ ,\ \ k \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta-1\};$$

$$\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{c} \leq 0.$$

Then

Corollary 1. *U is a full-dimensional cone. A vector $\mathbf{c}$ is a c.d.u. if $\mathbf{c}$ lies in the interior of U, and is not a c.d.u. if $\mathbf{c}$ can be separated from U.*

We now study some qualitative features of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, to better understand the set of c.d.u. We begin by noting that

Observation 2. *For all $\Delta \geq 3$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}_0 > 0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_1 < 0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_2 < 0$, and $\boldsymbol{\pi}_k > 0$ for all $k \in \{3, \ldots, \Delta\}$.*

That $\boldsymbol{\pi}_1 < 0, \boldsymbol{\pi}_2 < 0$, and $\boldsymbol{\pi}_k > 0$ for all $k \in \{3, \ldots, \Delta\}$ is not surprising, since biasing towards excluded nodes which are adjacent to few included nodes should tend to reduce alternation, "pushing" one into the uniqueness regime. That the cutoff occurs at exactly $k = 2$ can be further justified by noting that the average number of included neighbors of an excluded node in the hardcore model, at the critical activity λ_Δ, is $1 + (\Delta-1)^{-1} \in (1, 2)$. The counterintuititve feature of Observation 2, which seems to violate the above reasoning, is that $\boldsymbol{\pi}_0 > 0$, i.e. biasing towards excluded nodes with no included neighbors (which we subsequently refer to as 0-nodes) leads to non-uniqueness.

A heuristic explanation for this surprising phenomenon is that such a biasing encourages all the neighbors of each 0-node, which are all at the same parity, to share the same fate (i.e. exclusion), thus increasing parity dependence.

We now give an exact characterization for how moving in a c.d.u. changes the relevant occupancy probabilities. Let $\delta_{j,k}$ denote the dirac-delta function, namely $\delta_{j,k} = 1$ if $j = k$, and 0 otherwise. Let $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\boldsymbol{\nu}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\nu}_\Delta)$ denote the vector s.t. for $k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$, $\boldsymbol{\nu}_k \overset{\Delta}{=} (\lambda_\Delta \Delta)^{-1} \Lambda_{\Delta,k}$, where we note that $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ represents the set of occupation probabilities associated with the hardcore model at the critical activity. Also, let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \overset{\Delta}{=} \big(2\Delta(\Delta-2)\big)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\nu}$. For $k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$, let $\boldsymbol{\rho}^k = (\boldsymbol{\rho}^k_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\rho}^k_\Delta)$ denote the vector s.t. for $j \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}^k_j \overset{\Delta}{=} \Lambda_{\Delta,j}\Bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k\bigg(4 - (k-1)\Delta^2 + \big((\Delta^2 - 2\Delta + 2)k - \Delta^2\big)j\bigg) + \Delta^{-1}\delta_{j,k}\Bigg);$$

and $\boldsymbol{\rho}^+ = (\boldsymbol{\rho}^+_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\rho}^+_\Delta)$ denote the vector s.t. for $j \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}^+_j \overset{\Delta}{=} (2\Delta^2)^{-1}\Lambda_{\Delta,j}\big(-(\Delta+2) + \Delta j\big).$$

Also, let $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ denote the $(\Delta+1)\times(\Delta+1)$ matrix whose kth row equals $\boldsymbol{\rho}^k$, $k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$. Then

THEOREM 4. *For any c.d.u.* $\mathbf{c}$, $\lim_{h\downarrow 0} h^{-1}(\mathbf{p}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}) = \boldsymbol{\rho}\cdot\mathbf{c}$, *and* $\lim_{h\downarrow 0} h^{-1}(\mathbf{p}_+^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}} - \Delta^{-1}) = \boldsymbol{\rho}^+\cdot\mathbf{c}$.

Thus $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ captures how linear perturbations in the parameter space translate to linear perturbations in the space of occupancy probabilities. Note that it follows from Corollary 1 and Theorem 4 that the set of perturbations attainable in this manner is a polyhedral set, which may be expressed as an appropriate transformation of U. We now go one step further, explicitly carrying out this transformation and giving a concise set of linear inequalities. Let us say that a vector $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_\Delta, \mathbf{p}_+)$ is a convex perturbation of uniqueness (c.p.u.) iff there exists a c.d.u. $\mathbf{c}$ s.t. $(\mathbf{p}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_\Delta) = \boldsymbol{\rho}\cdot\mathbf{c}$, and $\mathbf{p}_+ = \boldsymbol{\rho}^+\cdot\mathbf{c}$. Let the polyhedron T equal the set of all vectors $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_{\Delta-1})$ s.t.

$$-\Lambda^{-1}_{\Delta,k-1}\mathbf{p}_{k-1} + 2\Lambda^{-1}_{\Delta,k}\mathbf{p}_k - \Lambda^{-1}_{\Delta,k+1}\mathbf{p}_{k+1} \leq 0\ ,\ \ k \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta-2\};$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-3}(\Delta+k)\mathbf{p}_k + \frac{2(\Delta^4 - 6\Delta^3 + 13\Delta^2 - 12\Delta + 2)}{(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)^2}\mathbf{p}_{\Delta-2} + \frac{2\Delta^2 - 5\Delta + 6}{\Delta-2}\mathbf{p}_{\Delta-1} \leq 0;$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-3} -\Delta(\Delta-1)(\Delta-k)(2k+\Delta-3)\mathbf{p}_k \leq 0.$$

Then

THEOREM 5. *T is a full-dimensional pointed cone. A vector $(\mathbf{p}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_{\Delta-1})$ corresponds to the first Δ components of some c.p.u. if $(\mathbf{p}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_{\Delta-1})$ lies in the interior of T, and does not correspond to the first Δ components of any c.p.u. if $(\mathbf{p}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_{\Delta-1})$ can be separated from T. Furthermore, any c.p.u. $\mathbf{p}$ satisfies*

$$\mathbf{p}_\Delta = -(2\Delta)^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}(\Delta+k)\mathbf{p}_k,$$

and

$$\mathbf{p}_+ = -(2\Delta)^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}(\Delta-k)\mathbf{p}_k.$$

As T is a pointed cone, it is the conic hull of its extreme rays, which one could in principle compute explicitly. Instead of pursuing such an analysis, we identify several important qualitative features of the set of c.p.u. In particular,

THEOREM 6. *For every c.p.u.* $\mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{p}_+ \leq 0, \mathbf{p}_0 \geq 0, \mathbf{p}_1 \geq 0,$ *and* $\mathbf{p}_k \leq 0, k \in \{2, \ldots, \Delta\}$.

Note that Theorem 6 implies that moving in a c.d.u. cannot allow one to sample from denser i.s., since $\mathbf{p}_+ \leq 0$. Indeed, it is even true that

COROLLARY 2. $\mathbf{0}$ *is the unique c.p.u. for which* $\mathbf{p}_+ = 0$.

That is to say, any non-trivial c.p.u. actually leads to strictly decreasing the density of the sampled i.s. The relevant question becomes *how* one can decrease the density of the sampled i.s. by moving along a c.d.u., and what kinds of trade-offs between the various components of the c.p.u. are attainable. As all underlying sets are polyhedral, l.p. is the right framework for analyzing these trade-offs. In particular, it follows from Corollary 1 and Theorem 4 that

OBSERVATION 3. *We may use l.p. to efficiently select the c.d.u. maximizing any linear function of the resulting c.p.u., subject to any number of additional linear constraints on the c.d.u.*

We now illustrate with a concrete example. Suppose that our underlying graph represents a communication network, in which each node is either broadcasting or not, and adjacent nodes cannot simultaneously broadcast. Suppose further that even if a node is not broadcasting, it can still partially utilize the signal of any neighboring nodes which are themselves broadcasting. Thus, from a quality-of-service (QOS) perspective, it is particularly undesirable for an excluded node to have no neighbors which are broadcasting, i.e. 0-nodes are undesirable. In Scenario I, suppose a system "controller" has been tasked with slightly reducing the overall density of broadcasting nodes by perturbing the underlying $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ vector, while minimizing the loss in QOS (increase in $\mathbf{p}_0$ per unit decrease in $\mathbf{p}_+$). The relevant optimization problem P I is

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \boldsymbol{\rho}^0 \cdot \mathbf{c} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{c} \in U \\ \boldsymbol{\rho}^+ \cdot \mathbf{c} &= -1 \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, in Scenario II, we consider a system "hacker" tasked with moving along a c.d.u. which maximizes the loss in QOS. The relevant optimization problem P II is

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \boldsymbol{\rho}^0 \cdot \mathbf{c} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{c} \in U \\ \boldsymbol{\rho}^+ \cdot \mathbf{c} &= -1 \end{aligned}$$

We now characterize the optimal solutions to P I and P II. Let $\mathbf{c}^I = (\mathbf{c}^I_0, \ldots, \mathbf{c}^I_\Delta)$ be the vector s.t. $\mathbf{c}^I \triangleq \frac{2\Delta^2}{(\Delta-2)\lambda_\Delta}\mathbf{1}$, and $\mathbf{c}^{II} = (\mathbf{c}^{II}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{c}^{II}_\Delta)$ be the vector s.t. $\mathbf{c}^{II}_k \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_\Delta^{-1}(\Delta - k) + \delta_{k,0}\Delta, k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$. Then

THEOREM 7. $\mathbf{c}^I$ *is an optimal c.d.u. for P I, and acheives a unit increase in* p_0 *of* $\tau_I^\Delta \triangleq \frac{\Delta+2}{(\Delta-2)\lambda_\Delta}$. $\mathbf{c}^{II}$ *is an optimal c.d.u. for P II, and acheives a unit increase in* p_0 *of* $\tau_{II}^\Delta \triangleq \frac{\Delta}{(\Delta-2)\lambda_\Delta} + 1$. *Furthermore,* $\lim_{\Delta\to\infty}(\tau_{II}^\Delta - \tau_I^\Delta) = 1 - 2e^{-1} \approx .264$.

Interestingly, Theorem 7 implies that to minimize the creation of 0-nodes, one should move along a "one-dimensional" c.d.u., which is exactly how one moves away from the critical activity in the hardcore model. Alternatively, to maximize the creation of 0-nodes, one should move along a non-trivial c.d.u. which cannot be realized in the hardcore model. Note that at the point $\mathbf{c}^{II}$, the constraint (of U) $-\mathbf{c}_0 + 2\mathbf{c}_1 - \mathbf{c}_2 \leq 0$ is not binding. This allows $\mathbf{c}_0^{II}$, which governs the bias towards 0-nodes, to be larger relative to the other co-ordinates.

3. Probabilities, partition functions, and proof of Theorem 1. In this section, we rephrase the probabilities and questions of interest in terms of the relevant p.f. For $i \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta\}$, let T_d^i denote the subtree of T_d consisting of r, and the subtree rooted at the the ith child of r. Also, for a b.c. $\mathbf{B}$ on $N_{\geq d-1}(r)$ in T_d, and $i \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta\}$, let $\mathbf{B}^i$ denote the b.c. which $\mathbf{B}$ induces on $N_{\geq d-1}(r)$ in T_d^i. Since $\{T_d^i, i = 1, \ldots, \Delta\}$ are all isomorphic, let us denote a generic version of this depth d rooted tree by T_d'. Note that T_d' is a modified Δ-regular tree, with a single extra (root) node "spiking out" on top. We denote the root of T_d' (formerly r) by v_0, and denote the single child of v_0 (formerly a child of r) by v_1. For a binary vector $\mathbf{x}$, let $|\mathbf{x}|$ denote $\sum_i \mathbf{x}_i$. For $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, and a b.c. $\mathbf{B}$ on $N_{\geq d-1}(v_0)$ in T_d', let $Z_d(i,j,\mathbf{B}) \overset{\Delta}{=} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{I}\in\mathcal{I}(T_d')\\ \mathcal{I}_{v_0}=i, \mathcal{I}_{v_1}=j\\ \partial\mathcal{I}=\mathbf{B}}} w_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},T_d'}(\mathcal{I})$, and $Z_d(i,\mathbf{B}) \overset{\Delta}{=} \frac{Z_d(i,0,\mathbf{B})}{Z_d(0,1,\mathbf{B})}$. Then it follows from the basic properties of i.s. that $\mathbb{P}_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},T_d}\Big(r \notin \mathcal{I}, |N(r)\bigcap\mathcal{I}| = k \big| \partial\mathcal{I} = \mathbf{B}\Big)$ equals

$$\frac{\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{I}\in I(T_d)\\ r\notin\mathcal{I}, |N(r)\bigcap\mathcal{I}|=k\\ \partial\mathcal{I}=\mathbf{B}}} w_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},T_d}(\mathcal{I})}{\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{I}\in I(T_d)\\ r\in\mathcal{I}\\ \partial\mathcal{I}=\mathbf{B}}} w_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},T_d}(\mathcal{I}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{I}\in I(T_d)\\ r\notin\mathcal{I}, |N(r)\bigcap\mathcal{I}|=i\\ \partial\mathcal{I}=\mathbf{B}}} w_{\lambda,\boldsymbol{\theta},T_d}(\mathcal{I})} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}\in\{0,1\}^\Delta\\ |\mathbf{x}|=k}} \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta} Z_d(0,\mathbf{x}_i,\mathbf{B}^i)}{\lambda \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta} Z_d(1,0,\mathbf{B}^i) + \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\theta}_i \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}\in\{0,1\}^\Delta\\ |\mathbf{x}|=i}} \prod_{j=1}^{\Delta} Z_d(0,\mathbf{x}_j,\mathbf{B}^j)},$$

which is itself equal to

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}\in\{0,1\}^\Delta\\ |\mathbf{x}|=k}} \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta} Z_d^{1-\mathbf{x}_i}(0,\mathbf{B}^i)}{\prod_{i=1}^{\Delta} Z_d(1,\mathbf{B}^i) + \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}\in\{0,1\}^\Delta\\ |\mathbf{x}|=i}} \prod_{j=1}^{\Delta} Z_d^{1-\mathbf{x}_j}(0,\mathbf{B}^j)}, \tag{8}$$

which we denote by $\mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},d}(\mathbf{B})$. We also let $\mathbf{p}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},d}(\mathbf{B})$ denote the vector $\big(\mathbf{p}_0^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},d}(\mathbf{B}), \ldots, \mathbf{p}_\Delta^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},d}(\mathbf{B})\big)$, and $\mathbf{p}_+^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},d}(\mathbf{B}) \overset{\Delta}{=} 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} \mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},d}(\mathbf{B})$ denote the probability that the root is included. We now derive several recursions for $Z_d(i,\mathbf{B})$, to aid in our analysis. Let $\zeta_d(\mathbf{B}) \overset{\Delta}{=} Z_d^{-1}(0,\mathbf{B})$. For $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta - 1\}$, let $\mathbf{B}^{i,j}$ denote the b.c. which $\mathbf{B}$ induces on $N_{\geq d-1}(v_0)$ in the subtree of T_d' consisting of v_0, v_1, the ith child of v_1, and the jth child of the ith child of v_1. Then

Lemma 1. *For all $d \geq 5$ and b.c.s* $\mathbf{B}$ *on* $N_{\geq d-1}(v_0)$ *in* T'_d,

$$Z_d(1,\mathbf{B}) = Z_d(0,\mathbf{B}) f\big(\zeta_{d-1}(\mathbf{B}^1), \zeta_{d-1}(\mathbf{B}^2), \ldots, \zeta_{d-1}(\mathbf{B}^{\Delta-1})\big),$$

and

$$\zeta_d(\mathbf{B}) = g\big(\zeta_{d-1}(\mathbf{B}^1), \zeta_{d-1}(\mathbf{B}^2), \ldots, \zeta_{d-1}(\mathbf{B}^{\Delta-1})\big) \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta-1} f\big(\zeta_{d-2}(\mathbf{B}^{i,1}), \zeta_{d-2}(\mathbf{B}^{i,2}), \ldots, \zeta_{d-2}(\mathbf{B}^{i,\Delta-1})\big).$$

Proof. Note that for $i \in \{0,1\}$,

$$Z_d(i,0,\mathbf{B}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^{\Delta-1}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{|\mathbf{x}|+i} \prod_{j=1}^{\Delta-1} Z_{d-1}(0, \mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{B}^j),$$

and

$$Z_d(0,1,\mathbf{B}) = \lambda \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta-1} Z_{d-1}(1,0,\mathbf{B}^i).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} Z_d(0,\mathbf{B}) &= \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^{\Delta-1}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{|\mathbf{x}|} \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta-1} Z_{d-1}(0, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{B}^i)}{\lambda \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta-1} Z_{d-1}(1,0,\mathbf{B}^i)} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta-1} \frac{Z_{d-1}(0,\mathbf{B}^i)}{Z_{d-1}(1,\mathbf{B}^i)} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^{\Delta-1}} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{|\mathbf{x}|} \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta-1} \zeta_{d-1}^{\mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{B}^i). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$Z_d(1,\mathbf{B}) = \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta-1} \frac{Z_{d-1}(0,\mathbf{B}^i)}{Z_{d-1}(1,\mathbf{B}^i)} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^{\Delta-1}} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{|\mathbf{x}|+1} \prod_{i=1}^{\Delta-1} \zeta_{d-1}^{\mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{B}^i).$$

Combining the above with the definition of f and g completes the proof. □

We now construct bounding sequences for $\sup_{\mathbf{B}} \zeta_d(\mathbf{B})$ and $\inf_{\mathbf{B}} \zeta_d(\mathbf{B})$. We will then argue that the upper bounding sequence and the lower bounding sequence are monotone, and thus have limits, which must satisfy a certain s.o.e. If these equations have a unique fixed point, then these upper and lower limits must coincide, providing a sufficient condition for uniqueness (i.e. Theorem 1). We note that the idea of using bounding sequences to show uniqueness of Gibbs measures has appeared before in the literature (e.g. [27]).

Let $\underline{\zeta}_5 \triangleq 0, \overline{\zeta}_5 \triangleq \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0^{-1}(\max_{i=0,\ldots,\Delta-1} \frac{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{i+1}}{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i})^{\Delta-1}, \underline{\zeta}_6 \triangleq \underline{\zeta}_5, \overline{\zeta}_6 \triangleq \overline{\zeta}_5$. For $d \geq 7$, let

$$\underline{\zeta}_d \triangleq g(\overline{\zeta}_{d-1}) \min_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{+\,(\Delta-1)} \\ \underline{\zeta}_{d-2}\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \overline{\zeta}_{d-2}\mathbf{1}}} f^{\Delta-1}(\mathbf{x}),$$

and

$$\overline{\zeta}_d \triangleq g(\underline{\zeta}_{d-1}) \max_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{+\,(\Delta-1)} \\ \underline{\zeta}_{d-2}\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \overline{\zeta}_{d-2}\mathbf{1}}} f^{\Delta-1}(\mathbf{x}).$$

We now prove that

Lemma 2. *For all* $d \geq 5$, $\underline{\zeta}_d \leq \inf_{\mathbf{B}} \zeta_d(\mathbf{B}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{B}} \zeta_d(\mathbf{B}) \leq \overline{\zeta}_d$.

Proof. It follows from the monotonicity of g that for all $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$,

$$g(\mathbf{x}) \leq \gamma_0^{-1}. \tag{9}$$

Also, since

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_{k+1} \sigma_k(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_k \sigma_k(\mathbf{x})} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{\gamma_k} \gamma_k \sigma_k(\mathbf{x})}{\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_k \sigma_k(\mathbf{x})}, \end{aligned}$$

$f(\mathbf{x})$ is a convex combination of $\{\frac{\gamma_{i+1}}{\gamma_i}, i = 0, \ldots, \Delta - 1\}$, and for all $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$,

$$\min_{i=0,\ldots,\Delta-1} \frac{\gamma_{i+1}}{\gamma_i} \leq f(\mathbf{x}) \leq \max_{i=0,\ldots,\Delta-1} \frac{\gamma_{i+1}}{\gamma_i}. \tag{10}$$

With (9)-(10) in hand, we proceed by induction. The base cases $d = 5, 6$ follows from non-negativity, Lemma 1, and (9)-(10). Now, suppose the induction is true for all $k \in \{5, \ldots, d-1\}$, for some $d \geq 7$. Then it follows from Lemma 1 and the monotonicity of g that $\underline{\zeta}_d \leq \inf_{\mathbf{B}} \zeta_d(\mathbf{B})$, and $\overline{\zeta}_d \geq \sup_{\mathbf{B}} \zeta_d(\mathbf{B})$, completing the proof. □

We now show that

Lemma 3. $\{\underline{\zeta}_d, d \geq 5\}$ *is monotone increasing, and* $\{\overline{\zeta}_d, d \geq 5\}$ *is monotone decreasing.*

Proof. We proceed by induction, simultaneously on both sequences. The base case, $d = 5, 6$, entails demonstrating that $\underline{\zeta}_5 \leq \underline{\zeta}_6 \leq \underline{\zeta}_7$, and $\overline{\zeta}_5 \geq \overline{\zeta}_6 \geq \overline{\zeta}_7$. That $\underline{\zeta}_5 \leq \underline{\zeta}_6 \leq \underline{\zeta}_7$ follows from non-negativity. That $\overline{\zeta}_5 \geq \overline{\zeta}_6 \geq \overline{\zeta}_7$ follows from (9)-(10). Now, suppose that $\underline{\zeta}_k \leq \underline{\zeta}_{k+1}, \overline{\zeta}_k \geq \overline{\zeta}_{k+1}$ for all $k \in \{5, \ldots, d-1\}$ for some $d \geq 8$. Then by the monotonicity of g, and the fact that minimizing over a smaller domain can only yield a larger objective,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\zeta}_d &= g(\overline{\zeta}_{d-1}) \min_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{+\ (\Delta-1)} \\ \underline{\zeta}_{d-2}\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \overline{\zeta}_{d-2}\mathbf{1}}} f^{\Delta-1}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\geq g(\overline{\zeta}_{d-2}) \min_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{+\ (\Delta-1)} \\ \underline{\zeta}_{d-3}\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \overline{\zeta}_{d-3}\mathbf{1}}} f^{\Delta-1}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \underline{\zeta}_{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, since maximizing over a larger domain can only yield a larger objective,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\zeta}_d &= g(\underline{\zeta}_{d-1}) \max_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{+\ (\Delta-1)} \\ \underline{\zeta}_{d-2}\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \overline{\zeta}_{d-2}\mathbf{1}}} f^{\Delta-1}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq g(\underline{\zeta}_{d-2}) \max_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{+\ (\Delta-1)} \\ \underline{\zeta}_{d-3}\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \overline{\zeta}_{d-3}\mathbf{1}}} f^{\Delta-1}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \overline{\zeta}_{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

It follows from Lemma 3 that $\overline{\zeta}_\infty \triangleq \lim\limits_{d\to\infty} \overline{\zeta}_d$ and $\underline{\zeta}_\infty \triangleq \lim\limits_{d\to\infty} \underline{\zeta}_d$ both exist. Furthermore, since $0 \leq \underline{\zeta}_d \leq \overline{\zeta}_d \leq \overline{\zeta}_5$ for all $d \geq 5$, the continuity of f and g on $\mathbb{R}^{+\,(\Delta-1)}$ imply that

Observation 4. *$0 \leq \underline{\zeta}_\infty \leq \overline{\zeta}_\infty < \infty$, and $(\underline{\zeta}_\infty, \overline{\zeta}_\infty)$ is a solution to the s.o.e. (4) - (5).*

With Observation 4, we now complete the proof of Theorem 1. We actually prove a slightly stronger statement (in terms of p.f.), from which Theorem 1 will easily follow.

Lemma 4. *The s.o.e. (4) - (5) always has at least one solution (x^*, y^*) on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ for which $x^* = y^*$. If the s.o.e. has a unique solution on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$, then*

$$x^* = \underline{\zeta}_\infty = \liminf_{d\to\infty} \inf_{\mathbf{B}} \zeta_d(\mathbf{B}) = \limsup_{d\to\infty} \sup_{\mathbf{B}} \zeta_d(\mathbf{B}) = \overline{\zeta}_\infty \triangleq \zeta_\infty.$$

Proof. We first demonstrate that (4) - (5) always have at least one solution (x^*, y^*) on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ for which $x^* = y^*$. Let $\eta(x) \triangleq x - g(x) f^{\Delta-1}(x)$. Note that $\eta(0) = -\frac{\gamma_1^{\Delta-1}}{\gamma_0^{\Delta}} < 0$. It follows from (9)-(10) that $\eta\Bigg(\gamma_0^{-1}\big(\max\limits_{i=0,\ldots,\Delta-1} \frac{\gamma_{i+1}}{\gamma_i}\big)^{\Delta-1}\Bigg) \geq 0$. As η is continuous on $[0, \infty)$, we conclude that there exists $z^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$ s.t. $\eta(z^*) = 0$, which implies that $z^*\mathbf{1}$ is a solution to the s.o.e.

Now, suppose (4) - (5) has a unique solution on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$. Then it must be that any solution (x, y) to the s.o.e. satisfies $x = x^* = y^* = y$. Since $(\underline{\zeta}_\infty, \overline{\zeta}_\infty)$ is such a solution, it follows that $\underline{\zeta}_\infty = \overline{\zeta}_\infty$, in which case the desired implication follows from Lemma 2. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $L(z) \triangleq \sum\limits_{i=0}^{\Delta} \gamma_i \binom{\Delta}{i} z^i$. It follows from (8), Lemma 1, and Lemma 4 that under the assumptions of Theorem 1, for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta\}$,

$$\liminf_{d\to\infty} \inf_{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},d}(\mathbf{B}) = \limsup_{d\to\infty} \sup_{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},d}(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \frac{\gamma_k \binom{\Delta}{k} \zeta_\infty^k}{f^{\Delta}(\zeta_\infty) + L(\zeta_\infty)}, \tag{11}$$

completing the proof. ☐

4. Log-convexity, monotonicity, and proof of Theorem 2.

In this section, we show that when $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is log-convex, the function f is monotone, causing the relevant s.o.e. to simplify considerably, and the conditions of Theorem 1 to become both necessary and sufficient (yielding Theorem 2). We begin by proving that

Lemma 5. *$\frac{d}{d\mathbf{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta-1\}$ and $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ iff $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is log-convex.*

Proof. Let us fix some $i \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta-1\}$. $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{x})$ will be the same sign as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_k \sigma_k(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i} \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_{k+1} \sigma_k(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_{k+1} \sigma_k(\mathbf{x}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i} \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_k \sigma_k(\mathbf{x}). \tag{12}$$

Let $\mathbf{x}^i$ denote the $(\Delta-2)$-dimensional vector equivalent to $\mathbf{x}$, but with component i removed. Note that $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i}\sigma_0(\mathbf{x}) = 0$, and for $k \geq 1$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i}\sigma_k(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}^i)$. Thus (12) equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1}\gamma_j\sigma_j(\mathbf{x})\sum_{k=1}^{\Delta-1}\gamma_{k+1}\sigma_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}^i) - \sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1}\gamma_{j+1}\sigma_j(\mathbf{x})\sum_{k=1}^{\Delta-1}\gamma_k\sigma_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}^i)\\
&\quad = \Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1}\gamma_j \sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+2}\sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big)\\
&\qquad -\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1}\gamma_{j+1} \sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+1}\sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

which itself equals

$$\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_j \sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+2}\sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big) \tag{13}$$

$$+\mathbf{x}_i\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+1} \sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+2}\sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big) \tag{14}$$

$$-\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+1} \sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+1}\sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big) \tag{15}$$

$$-\mathbf{x}_i\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+2} \sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}\gamma_{j+1}\sum_{\substack{S\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ |S|=j}}\prod_{l\in S}\mathbf{x}_l\Big). \tag{16}$$

It follows from the definition of $\sigma_j(\mathbf{x})$ that (13) is a polynomial function of $\mathbf{x}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{x}_{i-1},\mathbf{x}_{i+1},\ldots,\mathbf{x}_{\Delta-1}$, with degree at most two in any given variable. Equivalently, there exists a unique set of finite constants $\{\upsilon_{S_1,S_2}, S_1, S_2 \in 2^{\{1,\ldots\Delta-1\}\setminus i}, S_1\bigcap S_2 = \emptyset\}$ s.t. (13) equals

$$\sum_{\substack{S_1,S_2\in 2^{\{1,\ldots\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ S_1\bigcap S_2=\emptyset}} \upsilon_{S_1,S_2}\prod_{j\in S_1}\mathbf{x}_j\prod_{j\in S_2}\mathbf{x}_j^2.$$

We now compute υ_{S_1,S_2}. It follows from the "product of sums" form of (13) that

$$\upsilon_{S_1,S_2} = \sum_{\substack{A,B\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ A\bigcap B=S_2\\ A\bigcup B=S_1\bigcup S_2}}\gamma_{|A|}\gamma_{|B|+2}. \tag{17}$$

For any sets A, B, $|A| + |B| - |A \bigcap B| = |A \bigcup B|$. Thus if $A \bigcap B = S_2$, and $A \bigcup B = S_1 \bigcup S_2$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |A| + |B| - |S_2| &= |S_1 \bigcup S_2| \\ &= |S_1| + |S_2| - |S_1 \bigcap S_2| \\ &= |S_1| + |S_2|, \end{aligned}$$

since $S_1 \bigcap S_2 = \emptyset$. Equivalently,

$$|B| = |S_1| + 2|S_2| - |A|.$$

Combining with the fact that for each $A \in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}$ s.t. $S_2 \subseteq A$, there is exactly one set $B \in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}$ satisfying $A \bigcap B = S_2$ and $A \bigcup B = S_1$, i.e. $B = S_2 \bigcup (S_1 \setminus A)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \upsilon_{S_1,S_2} &= \sum_{\substack{A \in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i} \\ S_2 \subseteq A \subseteq S_1 \bigcup S_2}} \gamma_{|A|} \gamma_{|S_1|+2|S_2|-|A|+2} \\ &= \sum_{j=|S_2|}^{|S_1|+|S_2|} \binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|} \gamma_j \gamma_{2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, (14) equals

$$\sum_{\substack{S_1,S_2 \in 2^{\{1,\ldots\Delta-1\}\setminus i} \\ S_1 \bigcap S_2 = \emptyset}} \sum_{j=|S_2|}^{|S_1|+|S_2|} \binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|} \gamma_{j+1} \gamma_{2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+2} \, \mathbf{x}_i \prod_{j \in S_1} \mathbf{x}_j \prod_{j \in S_2} \mathbf{x}_j^2,$$

(15) equals

$$-\sum_{\substack{S_1,S_2 \in 2^{\{1,\ldots\Delta-1\}\setminus i} \\ S_1 \bigcap S_2 = \emptyset}} \sum_{j=|S_2|}^{|S_1|+|S_2|} \binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|} \gamma_{j+1} \gamma_{2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+1} \prod_{j \in S_1} \mathbf{x}_j \prod_{j \in S_2} \mathbf{x}_j^2,$$

and (16) equals

$$-\sum_{\substack{S_1,S_2 \in 2^{\{1,\ldots\Delta-1\}\setminus i} \\ S_1 \bigcap S_2 = \emptyset}} \sum_{j=|S_2|}^{|S_1|+|S_2|} \binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|} \gamma_{j+2} \gamma_{2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+1} \, \mathbf{x}_i \prod_{j \in S_1} \mathbf{x}_j \prod_{j \in S_2} \mathbf{x}_j^2.$$

For $S_1, S_2 \in 2^{\{1,\ldots\Delta-1\}\setminus i}$ and $j \in [|S_2|, |S_1| + |S_2|]$, let

$$z^1_{S_1,S_2}(j) \triangleq \gamma_j \gamma_{2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+2} - \gamma_{j+1} \gamma_{2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+1},$$

and

$$z^2_{S_1,S_2}(j) \triangleq \gamma_{j+1} \gamma_{2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+2} - \gamma_{j+2} \gamma_{2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+1}.$$

It follows that (12) equals

$$\sum_{\substack{S_1,S_2 \in 2^{\{1,\ldots\Delta-1\}\setminus i} \\ S_1 \bigcap S_2 = \emptyset}} \sum_{j=|S_2|}^{|S_1|+|S_2|} \binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|} z^1_{S_1,S_2}(j) \prod_{j \in S_1} \mathbf{x}_j \prod_{j \in S_2} \mathbf{x}_j^2 \tag{18}$$

$$+\sum_{\substack{S_1,S_2\in 2^{\{1,\ldots\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ S_1\bigcap S_2=\emptyset}}\ \sum_{j=|S_2|}^{|S_1|+|S_2|}\binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|}z^2_{S_1,S_2}(j)\ \mathbf{x}_i\prod_{j\in S_1}\mathbf{x}_j\prod_{j\in S_2}\mathbf{x}_j^2 \tag{19}$$

Note that $z^1_{S_1,S_2}(j)=-z^1_{S_1,S_2}(2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+1)$ for all j s.t. $j\in[|S_2|,|S_1|+|S_2|]$, and $2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+1\in[|S_2|,|S_1|+|S_2|]$, or equivalently $j\in[|S_2|+1,|S_1|+|S_2|]$. Combining with the monotonicity (in j) of the function $2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+1$, the fact that the unique solution to the equation $2|S_2|+|S_1|-x+1=x$ is $x=|S_2|+\frac{|S_1|+1}{2}$ (which may be non-integer), and the fact that whenever $|S_2|+\frac{|S_1|+1}{2}$ is an integer one has that $z^1_{S_1,S_2}(|S_2|+\frac{|S_1|+1}{2})=0$, we conclude that the coefficient of $\prod_{j\in S_1}\mathbf{x}_j\prod_{j\in S_2}\mathbf{x}_j^2$ in (18) equals

$$z^1_{S_1,S_2}(|S_2|)+\sum_{j=|S_2|+1}^{|S_2|+\lfloor\frac{|S_1|+1}{2}\rfloor}\left(\binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|}-\binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|-1}\right)z^1_{S_1,S_2}(j). \tag{20}$$

Similarly, note that $z^2_{S_1,S_2}(j)=z^2_{S_1,S_2}(2|S_2|+|S_1|-j)$ for all j s.t. $j\in[|S_2|,|S_1|+|S_2|]$, and $2|S_2|+|S_1|-j\in[|S_2|,|S_1|+|S_2|]$, or equivalently $j\in[|S_2|,|S_1|+|S_2|]$. Combining with the monotonicity (in j) of the function $2|S_2|+|S_1|-j$, the fact that the unique solution to the equation $2|S_2|+|S_1|-x=x$ is $x=|S_2|+\frac{|S_1|}{2}$ (which may be non-integer), and the fact that whenever $|S_2|+\frac{|S_1|}{2}$ is an integer one has that $z^2_{S_1,S_2}(|S_2|+\frac{|S_1|}{2})=0$, we conclude that the coefficient of $\mathbf{x}_i\prod_{j\in S_1}\mathbf{x}_j\prod_{j\in S_2}\mathbf{x}_j^2$ in (19) equals

$$\sum_{j=|S_2|}^{|S_2|+\lfloor\frac{|S_1|}{2}\rfloor}\left(\binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|}-\binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|}\right)z^2_{S_1,S_2}(j)\quad=\quad 0. \tag{21}$$

Combining the above, we find that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial\mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{x})$ is the same sign as

$$\sum_{\substack{S_1,S_2\in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}\\ S_1\bigcap S_2=\emptyset}}\left(z^1_{S_1,S_2}(|S_2|)+\sum_{j=|S_2|+1}^{|S_2|+\lfloor\frac{|S_1|+1}{2}\rfloor}\left(\binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|}-\binom{|S_1|}{j-|S_2|-1}\right)z^1_{S_1,S_2}(j)\right)\prod_{j\in S_1}\mathbf{x}_j\prod_{j\in S_2}\mathbf{x}_j^2. \tag{22}$$

Note that for all $j\in[|S_2|,|S_2|+\lfloor\frac{|S_1|+1}{2}\rfloor]$, one has that $2|S_2|+|S_1|-j+1\geq j$. Thus the definition of $z^1_{S_1,S_2}$ implies that for all $j\in[|S_2|,|S_2|+\lfloor\frac{|S_1|+1}{2}\rfloor]$, there exists $j'\geq j$ s.t. $z^1_{S_1,S_2}(j)=\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j'+1}-\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j+1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j'}$. It then follows from the definition of log-convexity that if $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is log-convex, then $z^1_{S_1,S_2}(j)\geq 0$ for all $j\in[|S_2|,|S_2|+\lfloor\frac{|S_1|+1}{2}\rfloor]$. Combining with (22) and the well-known monotonicity properties of the binomial coefficients, i.e. that for all $k\leq\lfloor\frac{|S_1|+1}{2}\rfloor$, one has that

$$\binom{|S_1|}{k}-\binom{|S_1|}{k-1}\geq 0, \tag{23}$$

demonstrates that the log-convexity of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ implies the desired monotonicity of f.

We now show that if $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is not log-convex, then there exists $\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ s.t. $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{x}) < 0$. Indeed, suppose that there exists some $k \in [0, \Delta - 2]$ s.t. $\frac{\gamma_{k+2}}{\gamma_{k+1}} < \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{\gamma_k}$. Let us fix some set $S^*_2 \in 2^{\{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}\setminus i}$ s.t. $|S^*_2| = k$. Note that the coefficient of $\prod_{j \in S^*_2} \mathbf{x}^2_j$ in (22) equals

$$z^1_{\emptyset, S^*_2}(|S^*_2|) \quad = \quad \gamma_k \gamma_{k+2} - \gamma_{k+1}\gamma_{k+1} \quad < \quad 0.$$

Let us fix some large positive integer M, and let $\mathbf{x}$ be the vector s.t. $\mathbf{x}_j = M^{-1}$ for $j \notin S^*_2$, and $\mathbf{x}_j = M$ for $j \in S^*_2$. Then for M sufficiently large, it is easily verified that (22) is dominated by the single term corresponding to $\prod_{j \in S^*_2} \mathbf{x}^2_j$, and thus $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i}(\mathbf{x}) < 0$, completing the proof. ☐

With Lemma 5 in hand, we now complete the proof of Theorem 2. We note that our proof of necessity also implies that the boundary condition in which all nodes on the boundary are included is "extremal" under the stated log-convexity assumption; i.e. if there is dependence on the boundary, than that particular boundary condition will induce oscillating behavior on the probability that the root is included.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. It follows from Lemma 5 that if $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is log-convex, then the s.o.e. (4) - (5) reduces to the s.o.e. (6) - (7), which (combined with Theorem 1) proves the sufficiency of the stated conditions. We now show that the conditions are also necessary. Suppose that the s.o.e. (6)-(7) has at least two distinct non-negative solutions. Let S denote the set of all 2-vectors (x, y) s.t. $0 \leq x \leq y < \infty$, and (x, y) is a solution to the s.o.e. Let $\overline{y} \overset{\Delta}{=} \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in S} \mathbf{z}_2$, i.e. the largest number appearing in any solution pair. We first show that $\overline{y}$ is itself part of some solution pair (i.e. it is not just approached). Indeed, consider any sequence of solution vectors $\{\mathbf{z}^i, i \geq 1\}$ s.t. $\lim_{i \to \infty} \mathbf{z}^i_2 = \overline{y}$. Since $\{\mathbf{z}^i_1, i \geq 1\}$ is uniformly bounded, the Bolzano-Weirerstrass Theorem implies that $\{\mathbf{z}^i, i \geq 1\}$ will itself have a subsequence $\{\mathbf{z}^{i_k}, k \geq 1\}$ s.t. $\{\mathbf{z}^{i_k}_1, k \geq 1\}$ converges, and let us denote this limit by $\overline{x}$. That $(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$ satisfies the s.o.e. then follows from the continuity of f and g. Similarly, let $\underline{x} \overset{\Delta}{=} \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in S} \mathbf{z}_1$, i.e. the smallest number appearing in any solution pair, and $\underline{y}$ the other number appearing in the corresponding solution pair (whose existence is guaranteed by the same argument used above). Note that $\underline{x} < \overline{y}$.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the b.c. with all nodes at depth d included. We now prove (by induction) that $\{\zeta_d(\mathcal{B}), d \geq 3\}$ has a non-vanishing parity-dependence, with even values lying below $\underline{x}$, and odd values lying above $\overline{y}$. We begin with the base cases $d = 3, 4$. Note that $Z_3(0, 0, \mathcal{B}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\Delta-1}_{\Delta-1}$, $Z_3(0, 1, \mathcal{B}) = \lambda \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\Delta-1}_{\Delta}$, and thus

$$\zeta_3(\mathcal{B}) = \gamma^{-1}_0 (\frac{\gamma_\Delta}{\gamma_{\Delta-1}})^{\Delta-1}.$$

That $\zeta_3(\mathcal{B}) \geq \overline{y}$ then follows from (9)-(10). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_4(0,0,\mathcal{B}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\{0,1\}^{\Delta-1}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{|x|}(\lambda\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\Delta}^{\Delta-1})^{|x|}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\Delta-1}^{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1-|x|} \\
&= \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^{\Delta-1}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\Delta-1}^{(\Delta-1)^2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\{0,1\}^{\Delta-1}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{|x|}\big(\gamma_0^{-1}(\frac{\gamma_\Delta}{\gamma_{\Delta-1}})^{\Delta-1}\big)^{|x|} \\
&= \boldsymbol{\theta}_0^{\Delta-1}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\Delta-1}^{(\Delta-1)^2}\lambda g^{-1}\big(\gamma_0^{-1}(\frac{\gamma_\Delta}{\gamma_{\Delta-1}})^{\Delta-1}\big),
\end{aligned}$$

and $Z_4(0,1,\mathcal{B}) = \lambda\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{\Delta-1}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\Delta-1}^{(\Delta-1)^2}$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta_4(\mathcal{B}) &= (\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_0})^{\Delta-1} g\big(\gamma_0^{-1}(\frac{\gamma_\Delta}{\gamma_{\Delta-1}})^{\Delta-1}\big). \\
&\leq f^{\Delta-1}(\underline{x})g(\underline{y}) \quad = \quad \underline{x},
\end{aligned}$$

with the final inequality following from (9) - (10), the fact that $\underline{y} = g(\underline{x})f^{\Delta-1}(\underline{y})$, and the monotonicity of g. This completes the proof for the base case.

Now, suppose the induction is true for all $d \in \{3,\ldots,2k\}$ for some $k \geq 2$. Then it follows from Lemma 1, and the monotonicity of f and g, that

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta_{2k+1}(\mathcal{B}) &= g\big(\zeta_{2k}(\mathcal{B})\big)f^{\Delta-1}\big(\zeta_{2k-1}(\mathcal{B})\big) \\
&\geq g(\underline{x})f^{\Delta-1}(\overline{y}) \\
&\geq g(\overline{x})f^{\Delta-1}(\overline{y}) \quad = \quad \overline{y} \quad , \quad \text{since } \underline{x} \leq \overline{x};
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta_{2k+2}(\mathcal{B}) &= g\big(\zeta_{2k+1}(\mathcal{B})\big)f^{\Delta-1}\big(\zeta_{2k}(\mathcal{B})\big) \\
&\leq g(\overline{y})f^{\Delta-1}(\underline{x}) \\
&\leq g(\underline{y})f^{\Delta-1}(\underline{x}) \quad = \quad \underline{x} \quad , \quad \text{since } \overline{y} \geq \underline{y},
\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof.

Recall that $L(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \gamma_i \binom{\Delta}{i} z^i$. Since $\{\mathcal{B}^i, i = 1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}$ are identical b.c., (8) and Lemma 1 imply that for all $d \geq 5$,

$$\mathbf{p}_+^{\gamma,d}(\mathcal{B}) = \left(1 + \frac{L\big(\zeta_d(\mathcal{B})\big)}{f^\Delta\big(\zeta_{d-1}(\mathcal{B})\big)}\right)^{-1}.$$

It follows from the monotonicity of L and f that for all even $d \geq 5$,

$$\mathbf{p}_+^{\gamma,d}(\mathcal{B}) \geq \big(1 + \frac{L(\underline{x})}{f^\Delta(\overline{y})}\big)^{-1},$$

while for all odd $d \geq 5$,

$$\mathbf{p}_+^{\gamma,d}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \big(1 + \frac{L(\overline{y})}{f^\Delta(\underline{x})}\big)^{-1}.$$

As

$$\big(1 + \frac{L(\underline{x})}{f^\Delta(\overline{y})}\big)^{-1} > \big(1 + \frac{L(\overline{y})}{f^\Delta(\underline{x})}\big)^{-1},$$

it follows that the conditions of the theorem are also necessary, completing the proof. □

5. A perturbative analysis, and proof of Theorem 3. In this section, we develop a perturbative approach to gain insight into the geometry of the uniqueness regime, proving Theorem 3. First, it will be useful to rewrite the s.o.e. (6) - (7). Note that g is a strictly decreasing function on $\mathbb{R}^+$, and thus has a well-defined inverse $g^{\leftarrow}$ with domain $(0, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0^{-1}]$. Let $p(x) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} x f^{-(\Delta-1)}(x)$, $q(x) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} g^{\leftarrow}\big(p(x)\big)$, and $r(x) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} q\big(q(x)\big) - x$. Then

Observation 5. *The s.o.e. (6) - (7) is equivalent to the s.o.e.*

$$r(x) \;=\; 0, \tag{24}$$

$$y = \; q(x). \tag{25}$$

Let $x_\Delta \stackrel{\Delta}{=} (\Delta-2)^{-1}$. We note that in the hardcore model, at the critical activity λ_Δ, the limit ζ_∞ exists and equals x_Δ. We now complete the proof of Theorem 3, and in fact prove a stronger result, which shows exactly how the solution to the s.o.e. (24) - (25) changes (as a perturbation around x_Δ) as one considers the perturbed vectors $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}$. For a fixed $\mathbf{c}$ and h, let $S^{\mathbf{c},h}$ denote the set of all solution pairs (x, y) to the s.o.e. (24) - (25) over $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$. If $S^{\mathbf{c},h}$ contains a unique solution (i.e. $\mathbf{c}$ is a c.d.u.), which (by Lemma 4) must be of the form $x\mathbf{1}$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we denote this x by $x_{\mathbf{c},h}$. Let

$$x_{\mathbf{c}} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \big(2\Delta(\Delta-2)^2\big)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} \Lambda_{\Delta,k}\big((\Delta^2 - 2\Delta + 2)k - \Delta^2\big)\mathbf{c}_k.$$

Then

Theorem 8. *A convex vector $\mathbf{c}$ is a d.u. if $\boldsymbol{\pi}\cdot\mathbf{c} < 0$, in which case $\lim_{h\downarrow 0} h^{-1}(x_{\mathbf{c},h} - x_\Delta) = x_{\mathbf{c}}$; and is a d.n.u. if $\boldsymbol{\pi}\cdot\mathbf{c} > 0$, in which case for all sufficiently small strictly positive h, there exist $(x_1^{\mathbf{c},h}, x_2^{\mathbf{c},h}) \in S^{\mathbf{c},h}$ s.t. $\lim_{h\downarrow 0}(x_1^{\mathbf{c},h} - x_\Delta)h^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \big(\frac{6(\Delta-1)}{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}\boldsymbol{\pi}\cdot\mathbf{c}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\lim_{h\downarrow 0}(x_2^{\mathbf{c},h} - x_\Delta)h^{-\frac{1}{2}} = -\big(\frac{6(\Delta-1)}{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}\boldsymbol{\pi}\cdot\mathbf{c}\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.*

Note that when a convex direction lies in the uniqueness regime, the corresponding limit $x_{\mathbf{c},h}$ is perturbed from x_Δ by a magnitude linear in h; while in the non-uniqueness regime, there are solutions perturbed from x_Δ by a magnitude non-linear in h. Before proving Theorem 3, we will derive Taylor expansions for r and various related functions. As these will often be joint expansions in both h and x, we will make the dependence on h explicit using a subscript notation, e.g. $r_h(x)$. When discussing the properties of such a function in a neighborhood of a value h_0 for h and x_0 for x, we use the notation (h_0, x_0) for the point of reference. For $l \in \{0,1\}$, let $f_l(x) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} \gamma_{k+l}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}x^k$, so $g(x) = f_0^{-1}(x)$, and $f(x) = f_1(x)g(x)$. For $l \in \{0,1\}$ and $i, j \in Z^+$, let

$$c_{f_l,i,j} \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \begin{cases} \dfrac{(\Delta-2)^{j+1}}{(\Delta-1)^j}\dbinom{\Delta-1}{j} & i = 0, j \in \{0,\ldots,\Delta-1\}; \\ \displaystyle\sum_{k=j}^{\Delta-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}\binom{k}{j}(\Delta-2)^{-(k-j)}\mathbf{c}_{k+l} & i = 1, j \in \{0,\ldots,\Delta-1\}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let

$$\kappa_0 \triangleq (\Delta-2)^{-2}\big((\Delta-1)c_{f_1,1,0} - \Delta c_{f_0,1,0}\big),$$

$$\kappa_1 \triangleq (\Delta-2)^{-2}\big((\Delta-1)c_{f_1,1,1} - (\Delta-2)c_{f_0,1,1}\big),$$

and $r'_h(x) \triangleq \partial_x r_h(x)$. Then

THEOREM 9. *$q_h(x)$, $r_h(x)$, and $r'_h(x)$ are jointly real analytic functions of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where they have the Taylor expansions*

$$q_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{q,i,j} h^i (x-x_\Delta)^j \;\;,\;\; r_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{r,i,j} h^i (x-x_\Delta)^j \;\;,\;\; r'_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{r',i,j} h^i (x-x_\Delta)^j.$$

Furthermore,

$$c_{q,0,0} = x_\Delta \;\;,\;\; c_{q,0,1} = -1,$$

$$c_{r,0,0} = 0 \;\;,\;\; c_{r,0,1} = 0 \;\;,\;\; c_{r,0,2} = 0 \;\;,\;\; c_{r,0,3} = \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2} \;\;,\;\; c_{r,1,0} = 0,$$

$$c_{r,1,1} = -\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1}c_{f_0,1,0} + \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}c_{f_1,1,0} - 2\kappa_1 \;\;,\;\; c_{r,2,0} = -\frac{1}{2}c_{r,1,1}\kappa_0,$$

and

$$c_{r',0,0} = 0 \;\;,\;\; c_{r',0,1} = 0 \;\;,\;\; c_{r',1,0} = c_{r,1,1}.$$

PROOF. The proof is deferred to the appendix. □

We will also need a certain continuity result, which ensures that for sufficiently small h, one can restrict the search for solutions to the s.o.e. (24) - (25) to a small neighborhood of x_Δ. In particular,

LEMMA 6. *For all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ s.t. if $h \in [0, \delta]$, $r_h(x) = 0$ implies $|x - x_\Delta| < \epsilon$.*

PROOF. The proof is deferred to the appendix. □

With Theorem 9 and Lemma 6 in hand, we now complete the proof of Theorem 8, which immediately implies Theorem 3.

PROOF OF THEOREM 8 AND THEOREM 3. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{r,1,1} &= -\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}(\Delta-2)^{-k}\mathbf{c}_k + \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}(\Delta-2)^{-k}\mathbf{c}_{k+1} \\ &\quad -\frac{2(\Delta-1)}{(\Delta-2)^2}\sum_{k=1}^{\Delta-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}k(\Delta-2)^{-(k-1)}\mathbf{c}_{k+1} + \frac{2}{\Delta-2}\sum_{k=1}^{\Delta-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}k(\Delta-2)^{-(k-1)}\mathbf{c}_k, \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,k}\Big(-\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1}(1-\frac{k}{\Delta}) + k - \frac{2(\Delta-1)}{\Delta}k(k-1) + 2k(1-\frac{k}{\Delta})\Big)\mathbf{c}_k \\ &= -(\Delta-1)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\pi}\cdot\mathbf{c}. \end{aligned}$$

First, suppose $\pi \cdot \mathbf{c} < 0$, and thus $c_{r,1,1} > 0$. Let x^*_h be any solution to (24), where we have made the dependence on h explicit. We begin by proving that there exists $\epsilon > 0$, depending only on $\mathbf{c}$, s.t.

$$h \in [0, \epsilon] \text{ implies } |x^*_h - x_\Delta| \leq (1 + |\kappa_0|)h. \tag{26}$$

Indeed, it follows from Theorem 9, Lemma 6, and the multivariate Taylor's theorem that for any fixed $\delta > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_\delta \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on δ and $\mathbf{c}$, s.t. $h \in [0, \epsilon_\delta]$ implies

$$\left| \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2}(x^*_h - x_\Delta)^3 + c_{r,1,1}(x^*_h - x_\Delta)h - \frac{1}{2}c_{r,1,1}\kappa_0 h^2 \right| \leq \delta\big(h|x^*_h - x_\Delta| + h^2 + |x^*_h - x_\Delta|^3\big). \tag{27}$$

Let $\delta = \min\big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{12(\Delta-1)^2}, \frac{1}{8}c_{r,1,1}\big)$. Suppose for contradiction that for some $h \in [0, \epsilon_\delta]$, $|x^*_h - x_\Delta| > (1 + |\kappa_0|)h$. Then $h^2 \leq (1 + |\kappa_0|)^{-1}|x^*_h - x_\Delta|h$, and since $(x^*_h - x_\Delta)^3$ is the same sign as $x^*_h - x_\Delta$, it follows that the l.h.s of (27) is at least

$$\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2}|x^*_h - x_\Delta|^3 + \frac{1}{2}c_{r,1,1}|x^*_h - x_\Delta|h.$$

However, the r.h.s. of (27) is at most

$$\delta|x^*_h - x_\Delta|^3 + 2\delta|x^*_h - x_\Delta|h,$$

and the desired result (26) then follows from the fact that our choice of δ leads to a contradiction.

We now prove that if $c_{r,1,1} > 0$, then there exists $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on $\mathbf{c}$, s.t. $h \in [0, \epsilon]$ implies that the s.o.e. (24) - (25) has a unique solution $x_{\mathbf{c},h}$. It follows from Theorem 9 and the multivariate Taylor's theorem that for any fixed $\delta > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_\delta \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on δ and $\mathbf{c}$, s.t. $h \in [0, \epsilon_\delta]$, $x \in \big[x_\Delta - (1 + |\kappa_0|)h, x_\Delta + (1 + |\kappa_0|)h\big]$ implies

$$\big|r'_h(x) - c_{r,1,1}h\big| \leq \delta h. \tag{28}$$

Taking $\delta = \frac{1}{2}c_{r,1,1}$, we conclude that there exists $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on $\mathbf{c}$, s.t.

$$h \in [0, \epsilon] \text{ implies } r'_h(x) > 0 \text{ for } x \in \big[x_\Delta - (1 + |\kappa_0|)h, x_\Delta + (1 + |\kappa_0|)h\big].$$

Combining with (26) completes the proof.

We now complete the proof of the first part of the theorem. Combining (26) and (27), we find that for any fixed $\delta > 0$, there exists $\epsilon_\delta \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on δ and $\mathbf{c}$, s.t. $h \in [0, \epsilon_\delta]$ implies

$$\left| c_{r,1,1}(x_{\mathbf{c},h} - x_\Delta)h - \frac{1}{2}c_{r,1,1}\kappa_0 h^2 \right| - \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2}\big(1 + |\kappa_0|\big)^3 h^3 \leq \delta(2 + |\kappa_0|)h^2 + \delta\big(1 + |\kappa_0|\big)^3 h^3,$$

and thus

$$\left| (x_{\mathbf{c},h} - x_\Delta)h^{-1} - \frac{1}{2}\kappa_0 \right| \leq \delta c^{-1}_{r,1,1}(2 + |\kappa_0|) + (\delta + \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2})c^{-1}_{r,1,1}\big(1 + |\kappa_0|\big)^3 h. \tag{29}$$

Letting $\delta, h \to 0$, it follows that

$$\lim_{h \downarrow 0} h^{-1}(x_{\mathbf{c},h} - x_\Delta) = \frac{1}{2}\kappa_0.$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_0 &= (\Delta-2)^{-2}\Big((\Delta-1)\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}x_\Delta^k\mathbf{c}_{k+1}-\Delta\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}x_\Delta^k\mathbf{c}_k\Big)\\ &= \big(\Delta(\Delta-2)^2\big)^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\binom{\Delta}{k}(\Delta-2)^{-k}\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)k-\Delta^2\big)\mathbf{c}_k \quad = \quad 2x_{\mathbf{c}}\end{aligned}$$

completes the proof.

Alternatively, suppose $\boldsymbol{\pi}\cdot\mathbf{c}>0$, and thus $c_{r,1,1}<0$. It follows from Theorem 9 and the multivariate Taylor's theorem that for any fixed $\delta>0$, there exists $\epsilon_\delta\in(0,\infty)$, depending only on δ and $\mathbf{c}$, s.t. $h\in[0,\epsilon_\delta]$, $x\in[x_\Delta-\epsilon_\delta,x_\Delta+\epsilon_\delta]$ implies

$$\left|r_h(x)-\left(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2}(x-x_\Delta)^3+c_{r,1,1}(x-x_\Delta)h\right)\right|\le\delta\big(h|x-x_\Delta|+|x-x_\Delta|^3+h^{\frac{3}{2}}\big). \tag{30}$$

Let $\alpha\triangleq-\dfrac{6(\Delta-1)^2}{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}c_{r,1,1}$, and $\epsilon\in(0,\alpha)$ be arbitrary. Let us fix a third strictly positive constant $\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)$ (to be defined), depending only on ϵ and $\mathbf{c}$, and apply (30) to conclude that there exists $\varsigma_{\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)}\in(0,\infty)$, depending only on $\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)$ and $\mathbf{c}$, s.t. $h\in[0,\varsigma_{\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)}]$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}r_h\big(x_\Delta+(\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}h^{\frac12}\big) &\ge \left(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2}(\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac32}+c_{r,1,1}(\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}\right)h^{\frac32}-\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)\left((\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}+(\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac32}+1\right)h^{\frac32}\\ &= (\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}\left(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2}\epsilon-\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)\left(1+\epsilon+\alpha+(\epsilon+\alpha)^{-\frac12}\right)\right)h^{\frac32}.\end{aligned}$$

Picking $\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)$ sufficiently small thus ensures that $r_h\big(x_\Delta+(\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}h^{\frac12}\big)>0$ for $h\in[0,\varsigma_{\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)}]$.

Repeating the same argument, but with $x_\Delta+(-\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}h^{\frac12}$, we conclude that under the same assumptions $r_h\big(x_\Delta+(-\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}h^{\frac12}\big)$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2}(-\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac32}+c_{r,1,1}(\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}\right)h^{\frac32}+\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)\left((-\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}+(-\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac32}+1\right)h^{\frac32}\\ &=(-\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}\left(-\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2}\epsilon+\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)\left(1-\epsilon+\alpha+(-\epsilon+\alpha)^{-\frac12}\right)\right)h^{\frac32},\end{aligned}$$

and picking $\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)$ sufficiently small thus ensures that $r_h\big(x_\Delta+(-\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}h^{\frac12}\big)<0$ for $h\in[0,\varsigma_{\delta(\alpha,\epsilon)}]$. We conclude that for all $\epsilon\in(0,\alpha)$, there exists $\delta(\epsilon,\mathbf{c})\in(0,\infty)$, depending only on ϵ and $\mathbf{c}$, s.t.

$$h\in[0,\delta(\epsilon,\mathbf{c})]\text{ implies that Eq. (24) has a solution lying in }[x_\Delta+(-\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}h^{\frac12},x_\Delta+(\epsilon+\alpha)^{\frac12}h^{\frac12}].$$

Combining the above with Theorem 9 (i.e. $c_{q,0,1}=-1$), the fact that $y=q_h(x)$, and the multivariate Taylor's Theorem, and taking the iterated limit $\lim\limits_{\epsilon\to0}\lim\limits_{h\to0}$, completes the proof. □

We now complete the proof of Corollary 1. We first formally define the constraint matrix of the polyhedron U. In particular, for $k\in\{1,\dots,\Delta-1\}$, let $\mathbf{u}^k=(\mathbf{u}_0^k,\dots,\mathbf{u}_\Delta^k)$ denote the vector s.t.

$$\mathbf{u}_j^k\triangleq\begin{cases}-1 & j=k-1;\\ 2 & j=k;\\ -1 & j=k+1;\\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Also, let $\mathbf{u}^\Delta \overset{\Delta}{=} \boldsymbol{\pi}$, and $\mathcal{U}$ denote the $\Delta \times (\Delta+1)$ matrix whose kth row equals $\mathbf{u}^k$, $k \in \{1,\ldots,\Delta\}$, i.e. $\mathcal{U}$ defines the constraint matrix of U. Before completing the proof, we also compute several relevant summations, as they will be useful in later proofs as well.

LEMMA 7.

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \Lambda_{\Delta,i} = (\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta} \quad , \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} i\Lambda_{\Delta,i} = \Delta\frac{(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}{(\Delta-2)^{\Delta}} \quad ,$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} i^2\Lambda_{\Delta,i} = 2\Delta\frac{(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}{(\Delta-2)^{\Delta}} \quad , \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} i^3\Lambda_{\Delta,i} = \Delta(5\Delta-6)\frac{(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-2}}{(\Delta-2)^{\Delta}}.$$

PROOF. The proof is deferred to the appendix. ☐

COROLLARY 3.

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\pi}_i = -(\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta-1} \quad , \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\pi}_i i = \Delta(\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta-1} \quad , \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}^k_i = (2\Delta^2)^{-1}\Lambda_{\Delta,k}(\Delta+2-\Delta k) \quad ,$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}^k_i i = (2\Delta)^{-1}\big(k\Delta-(\Delta+2)\big)\Lambda_{\Delta,k} \quad , \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}^+_i = -(2\Delta^2)^{-1}(\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta-1} \quad , \quad \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}^+_i i = (2\Delta)^{-1}(\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta-1} \quad ,$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}^k_i = \Lambda_{\Delta,i}(2\Delta^2)^{-1}(\Delta+2-\Delta i) \quad , \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} k\boldsymbol{\rho}^k_i = \Lambda_{\Delta,i}(2\Delta)^{-1}\big(\Delta i-(\Delta+2)\big).$$

PROOF. The proof is deferred to the appendix. ☐

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1. The second part of the corollary follows immediately from Theorem 3, and U is trivially a cone. All that remains to be shown is that U is full-dimensional. It suffices to demonstrate that

$$rank(\mathcal{U}) = \Delta, \tag{31}$$

since in that case the system of inequalities (s.o.i.) $\mathcal{U}\cdot\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0}$ has no implied equalities. It follows from a straightforward induction that $\{\mathbf{u}^k, k = 1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}$ are linearly independent, since for $k \in \{1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}$, $\mathbf{u}^k_{k+1} \neq 0$, while $\mathbf{u}^j_{k+1} = 0$ for all $j \leq k-1$. Thus it suffices to demonstrate that $\mathbf{u}^\Delta$ is not a linear combination of $\{\mathbf{u}^k, k = 1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}$. Suppose, for contradiction, that there exist $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{y}_{\Delta-1}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ s.t. $\mathbf{u}^\Delta = \boldsymbol{\pi} = \sum_{k=1}^{\Delta-1}\mathbf{y}_k\mathbf{u}^k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathbf{y}_1 &= \boldsymbol{\pi}_0;\\
2\mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2 &= \boldsymbol{\pi}_1;\\
-\mathbf{y}_{k-1} + 2\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{y}_{k+1} &= \boldsymbol{\pi}_k, k \in \{2,\ldots,\Delta-1\};\\
-\mathbf{y}_{\Delta-2} + 2\mathbf{y}_{\Delta-1} &= \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\Delta-1};\\
-\mathbf{y}_{\Delta-1} &= \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\Delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from a straightforward induction that $\mathbf{y}_k = -\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}(k-j)\boldsymbol{\pi}_j$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, \Delta - 1\}$. We conclude that $\mathbf{y}_{\Delta-1} = -\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-2}(\Delta - 1 - j)\boldsymbol{\pi}_j$. Combining with the fact that $-\mathbf{y}_{\Delta-1} = \boldsymbol{\pi}_\Delta$, we find that $\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta}(\Delta - 1 - j)\boldsymbol{\pi}_j = 0$. Combining with Corollary 3 yields a contradiction, since $(\Delta - 1)\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_j \neq \sum_{j=0}^{\Delta} j\boldsymbol{\pi}_j$, completing the proof. $\square$

6. Proof of Theorems 4 and 5. In this section, we complete the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5, characterizing how moving in a c.d.u. changes the relevant occupancy probabilities (i.e. c.p.u).

Proof of Theorem 4. We use the notation $o(h)$ to denote a function s.t. $\lim_{h\downarrow 0} h^{-1}o(h) = 0$. Let $\chi_{\mathbf{c},h} \triangleq h^{-1}(x_{\mathbf{c},h} - x_\Delta)$. Then it follows from Theorem 8 and (11) that for all sufficiently small non-negative h,

$$\mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}} = \gamma_k^{\mathbf{c},h}\binom{\Delta}{k}x_{\mathbf{c},h}^k\left(f^\Delta(x_{\mathbf{c},h}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\gamma_i^{\mathbf{c},h}\binom{\Delta}{i}x_{\mathbf{c},h}^i\right)^{-1}. \tag{32}$$

As $x_{\mathbf{c},h}\mathbf{1}$ is a solution to the s.o.e. (6) - (7), it follows that $x_{\mathbf{c},h} = g(x_{\mathbf{c},h})f^{\Delta-1}(x_{\mathbf{c},h})$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} f^\Delta(x_{\mathbf{c},h}) &= x_{\mathbf{c},h}f(x_{\mathbf{c},h})g^{-1}(x_{\mathbf{c},h}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta-1}\gamma_{i+1}^{\mathbf{c},h}\binom{\Delta-1}{i}x_{\mathbf{c},h}^{i+1} \;=\; \Delta^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\gamma_i^{\mathbf{c},h}\binom{\Delta}{i}x_{\mathbf{c},h}^i i. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (32), we find that $\mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}}$ equals

$$\gamma_k^{\mathbf{c},h}\binom{\Delta}{k}x_{\mathbf{c},h}^k\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}(1 + \Delta^{-1}i)\gamma_i^{\mathbf{c},h}\binom{\Delta}{i}x_{\mathbf{c},h}^i\right)^{-1},$$

which itself equals

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda_{\Delta,k}(\lambda_\Delta^{-1} + \mathbf{c}_k h)(1 + x_\Delta^{-1}\chi_{\mathbf{c},h}h)^k\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}(1 + \Delta^{-1}i)(\lambda_\Delta^{-1} + \mathbf{c}_i h)\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1 + x_\Delta^{-1}\chi_{\mathbf{c},h}h)^i\right)^{-1} \\ &= \Lambda_{\Delta,k}(\lambda_\Delta^{-1} + \mathbf{c}_k h)\big(1 + kx_\Delta^{-1}\chi_{\mathbf{c},h}h + o(h)\big)\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1 + \Delta^{-1}i)(\lambda_\Delta^{-1} + \mathbf{c}_i h)\big(1 + ix_\Delta^{-1}\chi_{\mathbf{c},h}h + o(h)\big)\right)^{-1} \\ &= \Lambda_{\Delta,k}\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\Big(1 + \big(\lambda_\Delta\mathbf{c}_k + (\Delta - 2)k\chi_{\mathbf{c},h}\big)h + o(h)\Big) \\ \times&\left(\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1 + \Delta^{-1}i) + (\Delta - 2)\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1 + \Delta^{-1}i)i\right)\chi_{\mathbf{c},h}h + \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1 + \Delta^{-1}i)\mathbf{c}_i h + o(h)\right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 7 and a straightforward calculation that $\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1+\Delta^{-1}i)=\Delta$, and $(\Delta-2)\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1+\Delta^{-1}i)i\Big)=\Delta^2-4$. Combining the above and simplifying, we conclude that

$$\mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}}=\Lambda_{\Delta,k}\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\Delta^{-1}\Bigg(1+\bigg(\Big((\Delta-2)k-\Delta^{-1}(\Delta^2-4)\Big)\chi_{\mathbf{c},h}-\Delta^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1+\Delta^{-1}i)\mathbf{c}_i+\lambda_\Delta\mathbf{c}_k\bigg)h\Bigg)+o(h).$$

As $\Lambda_{\Delta,k}\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\Delta^{-1}=\boldsymbol{\nu}_k$, and it follows from Theorem 8 that $\lim_{h\downarrow 0}\chi_{\mathbf{c},h}=x_{\mathbf{c}}$, we conclude that $\lim_{h\downarrow 0}h^{-1}(\mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}}-\boldsymbol{\nu}_k)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\nu}_k\Bigg(&\Big((\Delta-2)k-\Delta^{-1}(\Delta^2-4)\Big)\Big(\big(2\Delta(\Delta-2)^2\big)^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)i-\Delta^2\big)\mathbf{c}_i\Big)\\&-\Delta^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}(1+\Delta^{-1}i)\mathbf{c}_i+\lambda_\Delta\mathbf{c}_k\Bigg),\end{aligned}$$

which (after simplifying) completes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

We now prove the second part of the theorem. Since $\mathbf{p}_+^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}}=1-\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\mathbf{p}_k^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}}$, and it follows from Lemma 7 and a straightforward calculation that $1-\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\nu}_k=\Delta^{-1}$, the first part of the theorem implies

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{h\downarrow 0}h^{-1}(\mathbf{p}_+^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{c},h}}-\Delta^{-1}) &= -\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}^k\cdot\mathbf{c}\\ &= -\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k\Big(4-(k-1)\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)k-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,k}\bigg)\mathbf{c}_i\\ &= -\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k\Big(4-(k-1)\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)k-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\delta_{i,k}\bigg)\mathbf{c}_i.\end{aligned}$$

The second part of the theorem then follows from Lemma 7 and a straightforward calculation, completing the proof. □

We now complete the proof of Theorem 5, which gives an explicit polyhedral description of the set of c.p.u. Recall that $\mathcal{U}$ denotes the constraint matrix for the polyhedron U (which defines the set of c.d.u.), whose kth row equals $\mathbf{u}^k, k\in\{1,\ldots,\Delta\}$. We now similarly define the constraint matrix of the polyhedron T. It will be convenient to scale certain rows by positive constants, which does not effect the underlying cone. In particular, for $k\in\{1,\ldots,\Delta-2\}$, let $\mathbf{t}^k=(\mathbf{t}^k_0,\ldots,\mathbf{t}^k_{\Delta-1})$ denote the vector s.t.

$$\mathbf{t}^k_j \triangleq \begin{cases} -\Delta\Lambda^{-1}_{\Delta,k-1} & j = k-1; \\ 2\Delta\Lambda^{-1}_{\Delta,k} & j = k; \\ -\Delta\Lambda^{-1}_{\Delta,k+1} & j = k+1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Also, let $\mathbf{t}^{\Delta-1} = (\mathbf{t}^{\Delta-1}_0, \dots, \mathbf{t}^{\Delta-1}_{\Delta-1})$ denote the vector s.t.

$$\mathbf{t}^{\Delta-1}_j \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(\Delta-2)^{\Delta}(\Delta+j) & j \in \{0,\dots,\Delta-3\}; \\ \frac{(\Delta-2)^{\Delta-2}}{\Delta-1}(\Delta^4 - 6\Delta^3 + 13\Delta^2 - 12\Delta + 2) & j = \Delta-2; \\ \frac{1}{2}(\Delta-2)^{\Delta-1}(2\Delta^2 - 5\Delta + 6) & j = \Delta-1; \end{cases}$$

$\mathbf{t}^{\Delta} = (\mathbf{t}^{\Delta}_0, \dots, \mathbf{t}^{\Delta}_{\Delta-1})$ denote the vector s.t.

$$\mathbf{t}^{\Delta}_j \triangleq \begin{cases} -\Delta(\Delta-1)(\Delta-j)(2j+\Delta-3) & j \in \{0,\dots,\Delta-1\}; \end{cases}$$

and $\mathcal{T}$ denote the $\Delta \times \Delta$ matrix whose kth row equals $\mathbf{t}^k$, $k \in \{1,\dots,\Delta\}$, i.e. $\mathcal{T}$ defines the constraint matrix of T. It will also be convenient to introduce a "truncated version" of the matrix $\boldsymbol{\rho}$. In particular, let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ denote the $\Delta \times (\Delta+1)$ matrix consisting of the first Δ rows of $\boldsymbol{\rho}$.

We begin by proving several lemmas.

Lemma 8. $\mathcal{T} \cdot \tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. The proof is deferred to the appendix. □

Lemma 9. $\boldsymbol{\rho}^{\Delta} = -\frac{1}{2\Delta}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}(\Delta+k)\boldsymbol{\rho}^k$.

Proof. The proof is deferred to the appendix. □

With Lemmas 8 - 9 in hand, we now complete the proof of Theorem 5.

Proof of Theorem 5. It follows from elementary linear algebra that for any two matrices A, B, $rank(A \cdot B) \leq \min\big(rank(A), rank(B)\big)$. Combining with Lemma 8 and (31), we conclude that

$$rank(\mathcal{T}) = \Delta \quad , \quad rank(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) = \Delta, \tag{33}$$

and thus T is a full-dimensional pointed cone (in analogy with the proof of Corollary 1).

Since $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ is a $\Delta \times (\Delta+1)$ matrix with rank Δ, there must exist some vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Delta+1}$ s.t. the set of vectors $\{\boldsymbol{\rho}^k, k = 0, \dots, \Delta-1\} \bigcup \mathbf{z}$ is linearly independent. Let us fix such a vector $\mathbf{z}$, and let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ denote the $(\Delta+1) \times (\Delta+1)$ matrix whose first Δ rows comprise the matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$, and whose $(\Delta+1)$st row is $\mathbf{z}$. Since $rank(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) = \Delta+1$, the matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ has a well-defined inverse $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^{-1}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ denote the

$\Delta \times (\Delta+1)$ matrix whose first Δ columns comprise the matrix $\mathcal{T}$, and whose $(\Delta+1)$st column is $\mathbf{0}$. Then it follows from Lemma 8 that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}} = \mathcal{U}$, and therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{U} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^{-1}$.

Now, suppose that some vector $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_{\Delta-1})$ belongs to the interior of the polyhedron T, i.e. $\mathcal{T} \cdot \mathbf{p} < \mathbf{0}$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} \triangleq (\mathbf{p}, 0)$, and $\mathbf{c} \triangleq \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{p}}$. In that case,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} \cdot \mathbf{c} &= \mathcal{U} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{p}} \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{T} \cdot \mathbf{p} < \mathbf{0}$ implies $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{p}} < \mathbf{0}$, it follows that $\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathbf{c} < \mathbf{0}$, and thus $\mathbf{c}$ is a c.d.u. by Corollary 1. Furthermore, since $\mathbf{c} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{p}}$ implies that $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbf{c}$, we conclude that $\mathbf{p}_k = \boldsymbol{\rho}^k \cdot \mathbf{c}, k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta-1\}$. It follows that $\mathbf{p}$ are the first Δ components of some c.p.u.

Alternatively, suppose that $\mathbf{p}$ are the first Δ components of some c.p.u., i.e. there exists a c.d.u. $\mathbf{c}$ s.t. $\mathbf{p} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbf{c}$. In that case,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} \cdot \mathbf{p} &= \mathcal{T} \cdot \tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \cdot \mathbf{c} \\ &= \mathcal{U} \cdot \mathbf{c} \quad \leq \quad \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the fact that $\mathbf{c}$ is a c.d.u. It follows that $\mathbf{p}$ cannot be separated from T. Combining the above completes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

That any c.p.u. $\mathbf{p}$ satisfies $\mathbf{p}_\Delta = -(2\Delta)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} (\Delta+k)\mathbf{p}_k$ follows from Theorem 4 and Lemma 9. That $\mathbf{p}_+ = -(2\Delta)^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1} (\Delta-k)\mathbf{p}_k$ then follows from the fact that $\mathbf{p}_+ = -\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} \mathbf{p}_k$. Combining the above completes the proof. $\square$

7. Proof of Theorems 6 and 7.

In this section, we use Observation 3 to complete the proofs of Theorem 6, Corollary 2, and Theorem 7, by analyzing an appropriate set of l.p.s.

Proof of Theorem 6. For a vector $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_\Delta)$ which is not all-zeros, let $P^{\mathbf{z}}$ denote the l.p.

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{c} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{c} \in U \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding dual l.p., which we denote by $D^{\mathbf{z}}$, is

$$\begin{gathered} \min \quad \mathbf{0} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad -\mathbf{d}_1 + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_0 = \mathbf{z}_0 \\ 2\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2 + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_1 = \mathbf{z}_1 \\ -\mathbf{d}_{j-1} + 2\mathbf{d}_j - \mathbf{d}_{j+1} + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_j = \mathbf{z}_j \ , j \in \{2, \ldots, \Delta-2\} \\ -\mathbf{d}_{\Delta-2} + 2\mathbf{d}_{\Delta-1} + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\Delta-1} = \mathbf{z}_{\Delta-1} \quad (I) \\ -\mathbf{d}_{\Delta-1} + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_\Delta = \mathbf{z}_\Delta \quad (II) \\ \mathbf{d} \geq \mathbf{0} \end{gathered}$$

Recall that Corollary 1 implies U is full-dimensional, and thus it cannot be the case that $\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{c} = 0$ for all $\mathbf{c} \in U$. Combining with the fact that T is a cone, we conclude that at least one of $P^{\mathbf{z}}$, $P^{-\mathbf{z}}$ must be unbounded. Furthermore, since T is pointed and thus does not contain a line, it follows that exactly one of $P^{\mathbf{z}}$, $P^{-\mathbf{z}}$ is unbounded, while the other (bounded) l.p. must have optimal value 0. Applying strong duality, we conclude that $D^{\mathbf{z}}$ is infeasible iff $P^{-\mathbf{z}}$ has optimal value 0. We now prove that $D^{\boldsymbol{\rho}^k}$ is infeasible for $k \in \{0, 1\}$, $D^{-\boldsymbol{\rho}^k}$ is infeasible for $k \in \{2, \ldots, \Delta\}$, and $D^{-\boldsymbol{\rho}^+}$ is infeasible, implying the desired theorem.

It follows from a straightforward induction that any feasible solution (f.s.) $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta)$ for $D^{\mathbf{z}}$ (should such a f.s. exist) must satisfy

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (j-i)\big(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_i - \mathbf{z}_i\big) & j \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta - 1\}. \end{cases} \tag{34}$$

But by adding Equalities (I) and (II), we find that any f.s. $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ must also satisfy

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{\Delta-1} + \boldsymbol{\pi}_\Delta) - (\mathbf{z}_{\Delta-1} + \mathbf{z}_\Delta) + (\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-2}) = 0.$$

Since (34) implies $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-2} = \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta-2} \big(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_i - \mathbf{z}_i\big)$, we may combine the above to conclude that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\pi}_i - \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \mathbf{z}_i = 0$. Equivalently, after applying Corollary 3, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta = -(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \mathbf{z}_i$. Combining with the fact that the non-negativity constraints require that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta \geq 0$, we conclude that if $\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \mathbf{z}_i > 0$, then $D^{\mathbf{z}}$ is infeasible. It follows from Corollary 3 that $\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^k > 0$ for $k \in \{0, 1\}$, $\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^k < 0$ for $k \in \{2, \ldots, \Delta\}$, and $\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^+ < 0$. Combining the above completes the proof. $\square$

Before completing the proofs of Corollary 2 and Theorem 7, it will be useful to introduce some further notation and l.p.s. For vectors $\mathbf{z}^1 = (\mathbf{z}_0^1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_\Delta^1)$, $\mathbf{z}^2 = (\mathbf{z}_0^2, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_\Delta^2)$, and scalar y, let $P^{\mathbf{z}^1, \mathbf{z}^2, y}$ denote the l.p.

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \mathbf{z}^1 \cdot \mathbf{c} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{c} \in U \\ & \mathbf{z}^2 \cdot \mathbf{c} = y \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding dual l.p., which we denote by $D^{\mathbf{z}^1, \mathbf{z}^2, y}$, is

$$\begin{gathered} \min \quad \mathbf{d}_{\Delta+1} y \\ \text{s.t.} \quad -\mathbf{d}_1 + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_0 + \mathbf{d}_{\Delta+1} \mathbf{z}_0^2 = \mathbf{z}_0^1 \quad (I) \\ 2\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{d}_2 + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_1 + \mathbf{d}_{\Delta+1} \mathbf{z}_1^2 = \mathbf{z}_1^1 \quad (II) \\ -\mathbf{d}_{j-1} + 2\mathbf{d}_j - \mathbf{d}_{j+1} + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_j + \mathbf{d}_{\Delta+1} \mathbf{z}_j^2 = \mathbf{z}_j^1 \ , j \in \{2, \ldots, \Delta - 2\} \quad (A) \\ -\mathbf{d}_{\Delta-2} + 2\mathbf{d}_{\Delta-1} + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_{\Delta-1} + \mathbf{d}_{\Delta+1} \mathbf{z}_{\Delta-1}^2 = \mathbf{z}_{\Delta-1}^1 \quad (III) \\ -\mathbf{d}_{\Delta-1} + \mathbf{d}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_\Delta + \mathbf{d}_{\Delta+1} \mathbf{z}_\Delta^2 = \mathbf{z}_\Delta^1 \quad (IV) \\ \mathbf{d}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{d}_\Delta \geq 0 \end{gathered}$$

It follows from a straightforward induction that any f.s. $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1})$ for $D^{\mathbf{z}^1,\mathbf{z}^2,y}$ (should such a f.s. exist) satisfies (I),(II), and (A) iff

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} (j-i)\big(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_i + \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1}\mathbf{z}_i^2 - \mathbf{z}_i^1\big) \qquad j \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta-1\}; \right. \tag{35}$$

which implies that for $j \in \{2, \ldots, \Delta-2\}$,

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{j+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j) - (\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{j-1}) = \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_\Delta \boldsymbol{\pi}_j + \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1}\mathbf{z}_j^2 - \mathbf{z}_j^1. \tag{36}$$

We now prove several preliminary results w.r.t. various feasible solutions to the above l.p.s.

LEMMA 10. *There exists a feasible solution for the l.p.* $D^{-\boldsymbol{\rho}^0,\boldsymbol{\rho}^+,-1}$ *with value* $-\tau_I^\Delta$.

PROOF. The proof is deferred to the appendix. □

LEMMA 11. *There exists a feasible solution for the l.p.* $D^{\boldsymbol{\rho}^0,\boldsymbol{\rho}^+,-1}$ *with value* τ_{II}^Δ.

PROOF. The proof is deferred to the appendix. □

With Lemmas 10 and 11 in hand, we now complete the proofs of Corollary 2 and Theorem 7.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 2. It follows from Lemma 11 that the l.p. $D^{\boldsymbol{\rho}^0,\boldsymbol{\rho}^+,0}$ is feasible and has optimal value zero. Thus strong duality implies that the l.p. $P^{\boldsymbol{\rho}^0,\boldsymbol{\rho}^+,0}$ has optimal value 0 (note that $\mathbf{0}$ is always feasible). Combining with Theorem 6, we conclude that any c.p.u. $\mathbf{p}$ s.t. $\mathbf{p}_+ = 0$ must also satisfy $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq 0$, $\mathbf{p}_{\Delta-1} \leq 0$. But since Theorem 5 ensures that for any c.p.u. $\mathbf{p}$, $\{\Lambda_{\Delta,k}^{-1}\mathbf{p}_k, k = 0, \ldots, \Delta-1\}$ is convex, it follows that $\mathbf{p}_0 \leq 0$, $\mathbf{p}_{\Delta-1} \leq 0$ implies $\mathbf{p}_k \leq 0$ for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta-1\}$. Combining with the characterization for $\mathbf{p}_+$ given in Theorem 5 ensures that $\mathbf{p}_k = 0$ for all $k \in \{0, \ldots, \Delta-1\}$, since if any of the $\mathbf{p}_k$ was strictly negative, then $\mathbf{p}_+$ would be strictly positive. The characterization for $\mathbf{p}_\Delta$ given in Theorem 5 ensures that $\mathbf{p}_\Delta$ also equals zero in this case, completing the proof. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 7. That $\mathbf{c}^I$ is convex is trivial; that $\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{c}^I \leq 0$ follows from Corollary 3. It also follows from Corollary 3 that

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}^+ \cdot \mathbf{c}^I \quad = \quad 2\Delta^2(\Delta-2)^{-1}\lambda_\Delta^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^+ \quad = \quad -1,$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}^0 \cdot \mathbf{c}^I \quad = \quad 2\Delta^2(\Delta-2)^{-1}\lambda_\Delta^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^0 \quad = \quad \tau_I^\Delta.$$

Combining with Lemma 10 and strong duality completes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

We now show that $\mathbf{c}^{II}$ is a c.d.u., and begin by showing that $\mathbf{c}^{II}$ is convex. Note that $\mathbf{c}_1^{II} - \mathbf{c}_0^{II} = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda_\Delta^{-1} - \Delta$, while for all $k \in \{2, \ldots, \Delta\}$, $\mathbf{c}_k^{II} - \mathbf{c}_{k-1}^{II} = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda_\Delta^{-1}$, implying convexity. It follows from Corollary 3 that

$$\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{c}^{II} \quad = \quad \frac{1}{2}\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\big(\Delta \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\pi}_i - \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} i\boldsymbol{\pi}_i\big) + \Delta\boldsymbol{\pi}_0 \quad = \quad 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\rho}^{+}\cdot\mathbf{c}^{II} &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\Delta}^{-1}\big(\Delta\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{+}-\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{+}\big)+\Delta\boldsymbol{\rho}_0^{+} &= -1,\\ \boldsymbol{\rho}^{0}\cdot\mathbf{c}^{II} &= \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\Delta}^{-1}\big(\Delta\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{0}-\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{0}\big)+\Delta\boldsymbol{\rho}_0^{0} &= \tau_{II}^{\Delta}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining with Lemma 11 and strong duality completes the proof of the second part of the theorem. The final part of the theorem follows from the fact that $\lim_{\Delta\to\infty}\big((\Delta-2)^{-1}\lambda_{\Delta}^{-1}\big)=e^{-1}$, completing the proof. ☐

8. Conclusion.

In this paper, we used higher order M.r.f. to study i.s. in regular graphs of large girth. To our knowledge, this is the first such explicit analysis for i.s. We gave sufficient conditions for a second-order h.i.M.r.f. to admit a unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure on the infinite Δ-regular tree, and gave both necessary and sufficient conditions when the relevant clique potentials of the corresponding Gibbs measure satisfy a log-convexity assumption. We then developed a perturbative approach to gain further insight into the geometry of this $(\Delta+1)$-dimensional space (i.e. uniqueness regime). Interpreting our own model as a $(\Delta+1)$-dimensional perturbation of the hardcore model at the critical activity, we showed that under a convexity assumption, the set of all such perturbations which preserve uniqueness is a polyhedron with a simple description. We also gave an explicit polyhedral description for how one can change the occupancy probabilities through such a perturbation. We then used l.p. to analyze the properties of these polyhedra, showing that although one cannot acheive denser independent sets, it is possible to optimize the number of excluded nodes which are adjacent to no included nodes.

This work leaves many interesting directions for future research. The full power of higher order M.r.f. for sampling from i.s. in sparse graphs, and the associated uniqueness regime, remains poorly understood. Several questions build immediately on the models considered in this paper, e.g. what occupation probabilities can be attained by second-order h.i.M.r.f. with log-convex clique potentials in the uniqueness regime, outside of the neighborhood of the critical activity (i.e. the setting we analyze in depth), or the setting of log-concave clique potentials (which includes the restriction to maximal i.s.), where the relevant recursions also simplify. More generally, can one user higher order M.r.f. (in the uniqueness regime) to sample from denser i.s. than can be attained using the hardcore model at the critical activity? It would also be interesting to study higher order M.r.f. for related combinatorial problems, e.g. graph coloring.

The algorithmic implications of phase transitions for higher order M.r.f. also remain open questions. In particular, one would expect a "complexity transition" at the uniqueness threshold w.r.t. approximately computing the relevant p.f. and sampling from the associated distributions, as has been recently established for first order M.r.f. [121],[106],[107],[43],[3],[105],[78],[19],[124]. It would also be interesting to investigate the possibility of converting our perturbative analysis into a "gradient descent" algorithm for finding an "optimal" Gibbs measure, subject to a "uniqueness regime constraint". Another possible direction would be to investigate the connections between our work and the recent work on computing p.f. using belief propagation and related message-passing algorithms [21],[74],[104].

Finally, it is open to investigate the connection between higher order h.i.M.r.f. and recent research on sparse graph limits [80]. This includes work studying notions of convergence in large random graphs [5],[44], as well as other notions of convergent graph sequences [7],[13],[11],[59],[31],[32],[85]. It would also be interesting to study the relationship between higher order h.i.M.r.f. and the related notions of local algorithm and i.i.d. factor [48],[46],[47],[45],[81],[38],[12],[26],[59], in which one samples from the i.s. of a graph by assigning nodes random weights, and using these weights to select nodes for inclusion in a distributed, localized manner. In particular, to what extent are higher order h.i.M.r.f. and their associated Gibbs measures capable of (approximately) encoding the relevant distributions on i.s., especially if one generalizes to conditional M.r.f. and M.r.f. on larger label sets?

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Kavita Ramanan for several stimulating discussions.

9. Appendix.

9.1. *Proof of Theorem 9.* In this subsection we complete the proof of Theorem 9. We begin by deriving the relevant Taylor expansions for several other functions. We first prove that

LEMMA 12. *For $l \in \{0,1\}$, $f_{l,h}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion* $f_{l,h}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{f_l,i,j} h^i (x - x_\Delta)^j$.

PROOF. The real analyticity follows from the fact that $f_{l,h}(x)$ is a polynomial in h, x. Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{l,h}(x) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta-1} (\lambda_\Delta^{-1} + h\mathbf{c}_{i+l}) \binom{\Delta-1}{i} \big(x_\Delta + (x - x_\Delta)\big)^i \\
&= \lambda_\Delta^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta-1}\sum_{j=0}^{i} \binom{\Delta-1}{i}\binom{i}{j} x_\Delta^{i-j} (x - x_\Delta)^j \qquad (37)\\
&\quad + h \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta-1}\sum_{j=0}^{i} \mathbf{c}_{i+l} \binom{\Delta-1}{i}\binom{i}{j} x_\Delta^{i-j} (x - x_\Delta)^j. \qquad (38)
\end{aligned}
$$

We first analyze (37), which by an interchange in the order of summation equals

$$\lambda_\Delta^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1} (x - x_\Delta)^j \sum_{i=j}^{\Delta-1} \binom{\Delta-1}{i}\binom{i}{j} x_\Delta^{i-j}.$$

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=j}^{\Delta-1} \binom{\Delta-1}{i}\binom{i}{j} z^{i-j} &= (j!)^{-1} \frac{\partial^j}{\partial z^j} \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta-1} \binom{\Delta-1}{i} z^i \\
&= (j!)^{-1} \frac{\partial^j}{\partial z^j} (1+z)^{\Delta-1} = \binom{\Delta-1}{j} (z+1)^{\Delta-1-j},
\end{aligned}
$$

it follows that (37) equals

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1} c_{f_0,0,j} (x - x_\Delta)^j. \qquad (39)$$

We now analyze (38), which by an interchange in the order of summation equals

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1}\left(\sum_{i=j}^{\Delta-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{i}\binom{i}{j}x_\Delta^{i-j}\mathbf{c}_{i+l}\right)h(x-x_\Delta)^j \quad = \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1}c_{f_l,1,j}h(x-x_\Delta)^j. \tag{40}$$

Combining (37) - (38) with (39) and (40) completes the proof. $\square$

To proceed, we will need to compute similar expansions for various composite functions. We will rely on the following two facts about power series. The first, about composition of power series, follows from the multivariate Faa di Bruno formula [25].

Observation 6. *For two functions $\alpha_h(x), \beta_h(x)$ s.t. $\beta_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_0)$ and $\alpha_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $\big(0, \beta_0(x_0)\big)$, with associated coefficients $\{c_{\alpha,i,j}, i, j, \in Z^+\}$ and $\{c_{\beta,i,j}, i, j, \in Z^+\}$, the composite function $\eta_h(x) \overset{\Delta}{=} \alpha_h\big(\beta_h(x)\big)$ is itself a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_0)$, with associated coefficients $\{c_{\eta,i,j}, i, j, \in Z^+\}$ satisfying*

$$c_{\eta,i,j} = \delta_{j,0}c_{\alpha,i,0} + \sum_{i_1=0}^{i}\sum_{j_1=1}^{i+j}c_{\alpha,i_1,j_1}\sum_{\substack{(i_2^{(1)},j_2^{(1)}),\ldots,(i_2^{(j_1)},j_2^{(j_1)})\in\left(Z^+\times Z^+\setminus(0,0)\right)^{j_1}\\ \sum_{k=1}^{j_1}i_2^{(k)} = i-i_1\\ \sum_{k=1}^{j_1}j_2^{(k)} = j}}\ \prod_{k=1}^{j_1}c_{\beta,i_2^{(k)},j_2^{(k)}}.$$

Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{\eta,0,0} &= c_{\alpha,0,0},\\
c_{\eta,0,1} &= c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,0,1},\\
c_{\eta,0,2} &= c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,0,2} + c_{\alpha,0,2}c_{\beta,0,1}^2,\\
c_{\eta,0,3} &= c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,0,3} + 2c_{\alpha,0,2}c_{\beta,0,1}c_{\beta,0,2} + c_{\alpha,0,3}c_{\beta,0,1}^3,\\
c_{\eta,1,0} &= c_{\alpha,1,0} + c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,1,0},\\
c_{\eta,1,1} &= c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,1,1} + 2c_{\alpha,0,2}c_{\beta,1,0}c_{\beta,0,1} + c_{\alpha,1,1}c_{\beta,0,1},\\
c_{\eta,2,0} &= c_{\alpha,2,0} + c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,2,0} + c_{\alpha,0,2}c_{\beta,1,0}^2 + c_{\alpha,1,1}c_{\beta,1,0}.
\end{aligned}$$

The second, about multiplication of power series, is that

Observation 7. *For two functions $\alpha_h(x), \beta_h(x)$, both of which are jointly real analytic functions of h, x at $(0, x_0)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\alpha,i,j}, i, j, \in Z^+\}$ and $\{c_{\beta,i,j}, i, j, \in Z^+\}$, the product $\eta_h(x) \overset{\Delta}{=} \alpha_h(x)\beta_h(x)$ is itself a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_0)$, with associated coefficients $\{c_{\eta,i,j}, i, j, \in Z^+\}$ satisfying*

$$c_{\eta,i,j} = \sum_{i_1=0}^{i}\sum_{j_1=0}^{j}c_{\alpha,i_1,j_1}c_{\beta,i-i_1,j-j_1}.$$

Specifically,

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{\eta,0,0} &= c_{\alpha,0,0}c_{\beta,0,0},\\
c_{\eta,0,1} &= c_{\alpha,0,0}c_{\beta,0,1} + c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,0,0},\\
c_{\eta,0,2} &= c_{\alpha,0,0}c_{\beta,0,2} + c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,0,1} + c_{\alpha,0,2}c_{\beta,0,0},\\
c_{\eta,0,3} &= c_{\alpha,0,0}c_{\beta,0,3} + c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,0,2} + c_{\alpha,0,2}c_{\beta,0,1} + c_{\alpha,0,3}c_{\beta,0,0},\\
c_{\eta,1,0} &= c_{\alpha,0,0}c_{\beta,1,0} + c_{\alpha,1,0}c_{\beta,0,0},\\
c_{\eta,1,1} &= c_{\alpha,0,0}c_{\beta,1,1} + c_{\alpha,0,1}c_{\beta,1,0} + c_{\alpha,1,0}c_{\beta,0,1} + c_{\alpha,1,1}c_{\beta,0,0},\\
c_{\eta,2,0} &= c_{\alpha,0,0}c_{\beta,2,0} + c_{\alpha,1,0}c_{\beta,1,0} + c_{\alpha,2,0}c_{\beta,0,0}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We now use Observations 6 - 7 to derive expansions for several functions. In particular,

COROLLARY 4. *For $l \in \{0,1\}$, $f^{-1}_{l,h}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $f^{-1}_{l,h}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{f_l^{-1},i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,*

$$
c_{f_l^{-1},0,0} = (\Delta-2)^{-1} \ , \ c_{f_l^{-1},0,1} = -1 \ , \ c_{f_l^{-1},0,2} = \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)} \ , \ c_{f_l^{-1},0,3} = -\frac{(\Delta+1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2},
$$

$$
c_{f_l^{-1},1,0} = -\frac{c_{f_l,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2} \ , \ c_{f_l^{-1},1,1} = \frac{2c_{f_l,1,0}}{\Delta-2} - \frac{c_{f_l,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2} \ , \ c_{f_l^{-1},2,0} = \frac{c^2_{f_l,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^3}.
$$

PROOF. Let $\alpha_h(x) \triangleq c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(1-x)^{-1}$, $\beta_h(x) \triangleq -c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(f_{l,h}(x) - c_{f_l,0,0})$, and note that $f^{-1}_{l,h}(x) = \alpha_h\big(\beta_h(x)\big)$. Let

$$
c_{\alpha,i,j} \triangleq \begin{cases} c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0} & i=0, j\geq 0,\\ 0 & \text{otherwise;}\end{cases}
$$

$$
c_{\beta,i,j} \triangleq \begin{cases} 0 & i=0, j=0,\\ -c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,i,j} & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}
$$

Since $\beta_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\beta,i,j}, i,j \in Z^+\}$, $\beta_0(x_\Delta) = 0$, and $\alpha_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0,0)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\alpha,i,j}, i,j \in Z^+\}$, it follows from Observation 6 that $f^{-1}_{l,h}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $f^{-1}_{l,h}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{f_l^{-1},i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,

$$
c_{f_l^{-1},0,0} \quad = \quad c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0} \quad = \quad (\Delta-2)^{-1};
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{f_l^{-1},0,1} \quad &= \quad c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,0,1})\\
&= \quad (\Delta-2)^{-1}\bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\bigg) \quad = \quad -1;
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f_l^{-1},0,2} &= c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,0,2}) + c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,0,1})^2 \\
&= (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\frac{(\Delta-2)^3}{(\Delta-1)^2}\binom{\Delta-1}{2}\Bigg) + (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\Bigg)^2 \\
&= \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f_l^{-1},0,3} &= c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,0,3}) + 2c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,0,1})(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,0,2}) + c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,0,1})^3 \\
&= (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\frac{(\Delta-2)^4}{(\Delta-1)^3}\binom{\Delta-1}{3}\Bigg) \\
&\quad +2(\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\Bigg)\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\frac{(\Delta-2)^3}{(\Delta-1)^2}\binom{\Delta-1}{2}\Bigg) \\
&\quad +(\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\Bigg)^3 \quad = \quad -\frac{(\Delta+1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2};
\end{aligned}$$

$$c_{f_l^{-1},1,0} \quad = \quad c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,1,0}) \quad = \quad (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f_l,1,0}\Bigg) \quad = \quad -\frac{c_{f_l,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2};$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f_l^{-1},1,1} &= c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,1,1}) + 2c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,1,0})(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,0,1}) \\
&= (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f_l,1,1}\Bigg) \\
&\quad +2(\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f_l,1,0}\Bigg)\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\Bigg) \\
&= \frac{2c_{f_l,1,0}}{\Delta-2} - \frac{c_{f_l,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f_l^{-1},2,0} &= c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,2,0}) + c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}(-c^{-1}_{f_l,0,0}c_{f_l,1,0})^2 \\
&= (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}\cdot 0\Bigg) + (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Bigg(-(\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f_l,1,0}\Bigg)^2 \quad = \quad \frac{c^2_{f_l,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

For $i \geq 0$, let $\chi_i \overset{\Delta}{=} (\Delta-2)^{-1}(c_{f_1,1,i} - c_{f_0,1,i})$, and $\xi \overset{\Delta}{=} \chi_1 - (\Delta-2)\chi_0$. Then

Corollary 5. *$f_h^{-1}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $f_h^{-1}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{f^{-1},i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,*

$$c_{f^{-1},0,0} = 1 \;,\; c_{f^{-1},0,1} = 0 \;,\; c_{f^{-1},0,2} = 0 \;,\; c_{f^{-1},0,3} = 0 \;,\; c_{f^{-1},1,0} = -\chi_0,$$
$$c_{f^{-1},1,1} = -\xi \;,\; c_{f^{-1},2,0} = \frac{\chi_0 c_{f_1,1,0}}{\Delta-2}.$$

PROOF. Let $\alpha_h(x) \triangleq f_{0,h}(x)$, $\beta_h(x) \triangleq f_{1,h}^{-1}(x)$, and note that $f_h^{-1}(x) = \alpha_h(x)\beta_h(x)$. Let $c_{\alpha,i,j} \triangleq c_{f_0,i,j}$, and $c_{\beta,i,j} \triangleq c_{f_1^{-1},i,j}$. Since $\alpha_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\alpha,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, and $\beta_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\beta,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, it follows from Observation 7 that $f_h^{-1}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $f_h^{-1}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{f^{-1},i,j} h^i (x - x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,

$$c_{f^{-1},0,0} \quad = \quad c_{f_0,0,0}c_{f_1^{-1},0,0} \quad = \quad \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^1}{(\Delta-1)^0}\binom{\Delta-1}{0}\Big)\big((\Delta-2)^{-1}\big) \quad = \quad 1;$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f^{-1},0,1} \quad &= \quad c_{f_0,0,0}c_{f_1^{-1},0,1} + c_{f_0,0,1}c_{f_1^{-1},0,0} \\
&= \quad \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^1}{(\Delta-1)^0}\binom{\Delta-1}{0}\Big)(-1) + \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\Big)(\Delta-2)^{-1} \quad = \quad 0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f^{-1},0,2} \quad &= \quad c_{f_0,0,0}c_{f_1^{-1},0,2} + c_{f_0,0,1}c_{f_1^{-1},0,1} + c_{f_0,0,2}c_{f_1^{-1},0,0} \\
&= \quad \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^1}{(\Delta-1)^0}\binom{\Delta-1}{0}\Big)\Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big) + \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\Big)(-1) \\
&\quad\quad + \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^3}{(\Delta-1)^2}\binom{\Delta-1}{2}\Big)(\Delta-2)^{-1} \quad = \quad 0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f^{-1},0,3} \quad &= \quad c_{f_0,0,0}c_{f_1^{-1},0,3} + c_{f_0,0,1}c_{f_1^{-1},0,2} + c_{f_0,0,2}c_{f_1^{-1},0,1} + c_{f_0,0,3}c_{f_1^{-1},0,0} \\
&= \quad \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^1}{(\Delta-1)^0}\binom{\Delta-1}{0}\Big)\Big(-\frac{(\Delta+1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2}\Big) + \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\Big)\Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big) \\
&\quad\quad + \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^3}{(\Delta-1)^2}\binom{\Delta-1}{2}\Big)(-1) + \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^4}{(\Delta-1)^3}\binom{\Delta-1}{3}\Big)(\Delta-2)^{-1} \quad = \quad 0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f^{-1},1,0} \quad &= \quad c_{f_0,0,0}c_{f_1^{-1},1,0} + c_{f_0,1,0}c_{f_1^{-1},0,0} \\
&= \quad \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^1}{(\Delta-1)^0}\binom{\Delta-1}{0}\Big)\Big(-\frac{c_{f_1,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\Big) + c_{f_0,1,0}(\Delta-2)^{-1} \quad = \quad -\chi_0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{f^{-1},1,1} \quad &= \quad c_{f_0,0,0}c_{f_1^{-1},1,1} + c_{f_0,0,1}c_{f_1^{-1},1,0} + c_{f_0,1,0}c_{f_1^{-1},0,1} + c_{f_0,1,1}c_{f_1^{-1},0,0} \\
&= \quad \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^1}{(\Delta-1)^0}\binom{\Delta-1}{0}\Big)\Big(\frac{2c_{f_1,1,0}}{\Delta-2} - \frac{c_{f_1,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\Big) + \Big(\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{(\Delta-1)^1}\binom{\Delta-1}{1}\Big)\Big(-\frac{c_{f_1,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\Big) \\
&\quad\quad + c_{f_0,1,0}(-1) + c_{f_0,1,1}(\Delta-2)^{-1} \quad = \quad -\xi;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{f^{-1},2,0} &= c_{f_0,0,0}c_{f_1^{-1},2,0} + c_{f_0,1,0}c_{f_1^{-1},1,0} + c_{f_0,2,0}c_{f_1^{-1},0,0} \\ &= \left(\frac{(\Delta-2)^1}{(\Delta-1)^0}\binom{\Delta-1}{0}\right)\left(\frac{c^2_{f_1,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^3}\right) + c_{f_0,1,0}\left(-\frac{c_{f_1,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\right) + (0)(\Delta-2)^{-1} \quad = \quad \frac{\chi_0 c_{f_1,1,0}}{\Delta-2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

COROLLARY 6. *$f_h^{-(\Delta-1)}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $f_h^{-(\Delta-1)}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,*

$$c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} = 1 \ , \ c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,1} = 0 \ , \ c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,2} = 0 \ , \ c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,3} = 0 \ , \ c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},1,0} = -(\Delta-1)\chi_0,$$

$$c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},1,1} = -(\Delta-1)\xi \ , \ c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},2,0} = \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{2}\left(\frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}c_{f_1,1,0} - c_{f_0,1,0}\right).$$

PROOF. Let $\alpha_h(x) \triangleq x^{\Delta-1}$, $\beta_h(x) \triangleq f_h^{-1}(x)$, and note that $f_h^{-(\Delta-1)}(x) = \alpha_h\big(\beta_h(x)\big)$. Let

$$c_{\alpha,i,j} \triangleq \begin{cases} \binom{\Delta-1}{j} & i = 0, j \in \{0, \dots, \Delta-1\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

and $c_{\beta,i,j} \triangleq c_{f^{-1},i,j}$. Since $\beta_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\beta,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, $\beta_0(x_\Delta) = 1$, and $\alpha_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, 1)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\alpha,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, it follows from Observation 6 that $f_h^{-(\Delta-1)}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $f_h^{-(\Delta-1)}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,

$$c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} = \binom{\Delta-1}{0} = 1;$$

$$c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,1} = \binom{\Delta-1}{1}c_{f^{-1},0,1} = \binom{\Delta-1}{1}(0) = 0;$$

$$c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,2} = \binom{\Delta-1}{1}c_{f^{-1},0,2} + \binom{\Delta-1}{2}c^2_{f^{-1},0,1} = \binom{\Delta-1}{1}(0) + \binom{\Delta-1}{2}(0) = 0;$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,3} &= \binom{\Delta-1}{1}c_{f^{-1},0,3} + 2\binom{\Delta-1}{2}c_{f^{-1},0,1}c_{f^{-1},0,2} + \binom{\Delta-1}{3}c^3_{f^{-1},0,1} \\ &= \binom{\Delta-1}{1}(0) + 2\binom{\Delta-1}{2}(0)(0) + \binom{\Delta-1}{3}(0) \quad = \quad 0; \end{aligned}$$

$$c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},1,0} \quad = \quad 0 + \binom{\Delta-1}{1} c_{f^{-1},1,0} \quad = \quad -(\Delta-1)\chi_0;$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},1,1} \quad &= \quad \binom{\Delta-1}{1} c_{f^{-1},1,1} + 2\binom{\Delta-1}{2} c_{f^{-1},1,0} c_{f^{-1},0,1} + (0) c_{f^{-1},0,1} \\ &= \quad (\Delta-1)(-\xi) + 2\binom{\Delta-1}{2}(-\chi_0)(0) \quad = \quad -(\Delta-1)\xi; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},2,0} \quad &= \quad 0 + \binom{\Delta-1}{1} c_{f^{-1},2,0} + \binom{\Delta-1}{2} c^2_{f^{-1},1,0} + (0) c_{f^{-1},1,0} \\ &= \quad (\Delta-1)\left(\frac{\chi_0 c_{f_1,1,0}}{\Delta-2}\right) + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)\chi_0^2 \quad = \quad \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{2}\left(\frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2} c_{f_1,1,0} - c_{f_0,1,0}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 7. *$p_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $p_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{p,i,j} h^i (x - x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,*

$$c_{p,0,0} = (\Delta-2)^{-1} \quad , \quad c_{p,0,1} = 1 \quad , \quad c_{p,0,2} = 0 \quad , \quad c_{p,0,3} = 0 \quad , \quad c_{p,1,0} = -\frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{\Delta-2},$$

$$c_{p,1,1} = -\frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_1}{\Delta-2} \quad , \quad c_{p,2,0} = \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{2(\Delta-2)}\left(\frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2} c_{f_1,1,0} - c_{f_0,1,0}\right).$$

Proof. Let $\alpha_h(x) \triangleq x$, $\beta_h(x) \triangleq f_h^{-(\Delta-1)}(x)$, and note that $p_h(x) = \alpha_h(x)\beta_h(x)$. Let

$$c_{\alpha,i,j} \triangleq \begin{cases} (\Delta-2)^{-1} & i = 0, j = 0; \\ 1 & i = 0, j = 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $c_{\beta,i,j} \triangleq c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},i,j}$. Since $\alpha_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\alpha,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, and $\beta_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\beta,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, it follows from Observation 7 that $p_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $p_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{p,i,j} h^i (x - x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,

$$c_{p,0,0} \quad = \quad (\Delta-2)^{-1} c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} \quad = \quad (\Delta-2)^{-1}(1) \quad = \quad (\Delta-2)^{-1};$$

$$c_{p,0,1} \quad = \quad (\Delta-2)^{-1} c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,1} + (1) c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} \quad = \quad (\Delta-2)^{-1}(0) + (1)(1) \quad = \quad 1;$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{p,0,2} &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,2} + (1)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,1} + (0)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} \\ &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}(0) + (1)(0) \quad = \quad 0; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{p,0,3} &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,3} + (1)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,2} + (0)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,1} + (0)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} \\ &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}(0) + (1)(0) \quad = \quad 0; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{p,1,0} &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},1,0} + (0)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} \\ &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Big(-(\Delta-1)\chi_0\Big) + (0)(1) \quad = \quad -\frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{\Delta-2}; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{p,1,1} &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},1,1} + (1)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},1,0} + (0)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,1} + (0)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} \\ &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Big(-(\Delta-1)\xi\Big) + (1)\Big(-(\Delta-1)\chi_0\Big) \quad = \quad -\frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_1}{\Delta-2}; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{p,2,0} &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},2,0} + (0)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},1,0} + (0)c_{f^{-(\Delta-1)},0,0} \\ &= (\Delta-2)^{-1}\Big(\frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{2}(\frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}c_{f_1,1,0} - c_{f_0,1,0})\Big) \quad = \quad \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{2(\Delta-2)}(\frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}c_{f_1,1,0} - c_{f_0,1,0}). \end{aligned}$$

□

COROLLARY 8. *$g_h^{\leftarrow}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $g_h^{\leftarrow}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{g^{\leftarrow},i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,*

$$c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,0} = (\Delta-2)^{-1} \quad , \quad c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1} = -1 \ , \ c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2} = \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)} \ , \ c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,3} = -\frac{\Delta(2\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2},$$

$$c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,0} = -\frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2} \ , \ c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,1} = \frac{c_{f_0,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2} - \frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{\Delta-1} \ , \ c_{g^{\leftarrow},2,0} = \frac{c_{f_0,1,0}\big(2(\Delta-1)c_{f_0,1,1} - (\Delta-2)^2c_{f_0,1,0}\big)}{2(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)^4}.$$

PROOF. It follows from the Lagrange Inversion Theorem that $g_h^{\leftarrow}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $\big(0, g_0(x_\Delta)\big)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(x_\Delta) &= \Big(\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}\lambda_\Delta^{-1}\binom{\Delta-1}{k}x_\Delta^k\Big)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}{(\Delta-2)^\Delta}(1+x_\Delta)^{-(\Delta-1)} \quad = \quad x_\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that $g_h^{\leftarrow}(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where the coefficients $\{c_{g^{\leftarrow},i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$ may be determined from $\{c_{f_0^{-1},i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$ by matching the coefficients in the

Taylor series of the composite function $g_h^{\leftarrow}\big(g_h(x)\big)$ to those of the identity function, and solving the associated s.o.e. Thus letting $\alpha_h(x) \triangleq g_h^{\leftarrow}(x), \beta_h(x) \triangleq g_h(x) = f_{0,h}^{-1}(x)$, it follows from Observation 6 that

$$\begin{aligned}
x_\Delta &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,0};\\
1 &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},0,1};\\
0 &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},0,2} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c^2_{f_0^{-1},0,1};\\
0 &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},0,3} + 2c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c_{f_0^{-1},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},0,2} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,3}c^3_{f_0^{-1},0,1};\\
0 &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},1,0};\\
0 &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},1,1} + 2c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c_{f_0^{-1},1,0}c_{f_0^{-1},0,1} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,1}c_{f_0^{-1},0,1};\\
0 &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},2,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},2,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c^2_{f_0^{-1},1,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,1}c_{f_0^{-1},1,0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Solving this s.o.e., we find that

$$c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,0} = (\Delta - 2)^{-1};$$

$$c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1} = c^{-1}_{f_0^{-1},0,1} = -1;$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2} &= -c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},0,2}c^{-2}_{f_0^{-1},0,1}\\
&= -(-1)\left(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\right)(-1)^{-2} = \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,3} &= -c^{-3}_{f_0^{-1},0,1}\left(c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},0,3} + 2c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c_{f_0^{-1},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},0,2}\right)\\
&= -(-1)^{-3}\left((-1)\left(-\frac{(\Delta+1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2}\right) + 2\left(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\right)(-1)\left(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\right)\right)\\
&= -\frac{(2\Delta-1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2};
\end{aligned}$$

$$c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,0} = -c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},1,0} = -(-1)\left(-\frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\right) = -\frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2};$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,1} &= -c^{-1}_{f_0^{-1},0,1}\left(c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},1,1} + 2c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c_{f_0^{-1},1,0}c_{f_0^{-1},0,1}\right)\\
&= -(-1)^{-1}\left((-1)\left(\frac{2c_{f_0,1,0}}{\Delta-2} - \frac{c_{f_0,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\right) + 2\left(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\right)\left(-\frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\right)(-1)\right)\\
&= \frac{c_{f_0,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2} - \frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{\Delta-1};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{g^{\leftarrow},2,0} &= -\Big(c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{f_0^{-1},2,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c^2_{f_0^{-1},1,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,1}c_{f_0^{-1},1,0}\Big) \\
&= -\Bigg((-1)\Big(\frac{c^2_{f_0,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^3}\Big) + \Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big)\Big(-\frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\Big)^2 + \Big(\frac{c_{f_0,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2} - \frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{\Delta-1}\Big)\Big(-\frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\Big)\Bigg) \\
&= \frac{c_{f_0,1,0}\big(2(\Delta-1)c_{f_0,1,1} - (\Delta-2)^2 c_{f_0,1,0}\big)}{2(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)^4}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Recall that $\kappa_0 = (\Delta-2)^{-2}\big((\Delta-1)c_{f_1,1,0} - \Delta c_{f_0,1,0}\big)$, and $\kappa_1 = (\Delta-2)^{-2}\big((\Delta-1)c_{f_1,1,1} - (\Delta-2)c_{f_0,1,1}\big)$. Also, let $\kappa_2 \overset{\Delta}{=} -(\Delta-2)^{-3}\big((\Delta-1)c_{f_0,1,1} + (\Delta-2)c_{f_0,1,0}\big)$. Then

Corollary 9. *$q_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $q_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{q,i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,*

$$c_{q,0,0} = (\Delta-2)^{-1} \;,\; c_{q,0,1} = -1 \;,\; c_{q,0,2} = \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)} \;,\; c_{q,0,3} = -\frac{(2\Delta-1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2},$$

$$c_{q,1,0} = \kappa_0 \;,\; c_{q,1,1} = \frac{\Delta^2-2\Delta+2}{(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)}c_{f_0,1,0} - \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}c_{f_1,1,0} + \kappa_1 \;,\; c_{q,2,0} = c_{g^{\leftarrow},2,0} + \chi_0\kappa_2.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha_h(x) \overset{\Delta}{=} g_h^{\leftarrow}(x), \beta_h(x) \overset{\Delta}{=} p_h(x)$, and note that $q_h(x) = \alpha_h\big(\beta_h(x)\big)$. Let $c_{\alpha,i,j} \overset{\Delta}{=} c_{g^{\leftarrow},i,j}, c_{\beta,i,j} \overset{\Delta}{=} c_{p,i,j}$. Since $\beta_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\beta,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, $\beta_0(x_\Delta) = x_\Delta$, and $\alpha_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\alpha,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, it follows from Observation 6 that $q_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $q_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{q,i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,

$$c_{q,0,0} = c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,0} = (\Delta-2)^{-1};$$

$$c_{q,0,1} = c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{p,0,1} = (-1)(1) = -1;$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{q,0,2} &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{p,0,2} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c^2_{p,0,1} \\
&= (-1)(0) + \Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big)(1)^2 = \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{q,0,3} &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{p,0,3} + 2c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c_{p,0,1}c_{p,0,2} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,3}c^3_{p,0,1} \\
&= (-1)(0) + 2\Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big)(1)(0) + \Big(-\frac{(2\Delta-1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2}\Big)(1)^3 = -\frac{\Delta(2\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2};
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{q,1,0} &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{p,1,0} \\
&= \Big(- \frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{(\Delta-2)^2}\Big) + (-1)\Big(- \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{\Delta-2}\Big) \quad = \quad \kappa_0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{q,1,1} &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{p,1,1} + 2c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c_{p,1,0}c_{p,0,1} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,1}c_{p,0,1} \\
&= (-1)\Big(- \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_1}{\Delta-2}\Big) + 2\Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big)\Big(- \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{\Delta-2}\Big)(1) + \Big(\frac{c_{f_0,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2} - \frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{\Delta-1}\Big)(1) \\
&= \frac{\Delta^2-2\Delta+2}{(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)}c_{f_0,1,0} - \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}c_{f_1,1,0} + \kappa_1;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{q,2,0} &= c_{g^{\leftarrow},2,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,1}c_{p,2,0} + c_{g^{\leftarrow},0,2}c_{p,1,0}^2 + c_{g^{\leftarrow},1,1}c_{p,1,0} \\
&= c_{g^{\leftarrow},2,0} + (-1)\Big(\frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{2(\Delta-2)}\big(\frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}c_{f_1,1,0} - c_{f_0,1,0}\big)\Big) + \Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big)\Big(- \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{\Delta-2}\Big)^2 \\
&\quad +\Big(\frac{c_{f_0,1,1}}{(\Delta-2)^2} - \frac{c_{f_0,1,0}}{\Delta-1}\Big)\Big(- \frac{(\Delta-1)\chi_0}{\Delta-2}\Big) \quad = \quad c_{g^{\leftarrow},2,0} + \chi_0\kappa_2.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

With Corollaries 4 - 9 in hand, we now complete the proof of Theorem 9.

Proof of Theorem 9. Let $\alpha_h(x) \triangleq q_h(x), \beta_h(x) \triangleq q_h(x)$. Let $c_{\alpha,i,j} \triangleq c_{q,i,j}, c_{\beta,i,j} \triangleq c_{q,i,j}$. Since $\beta_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\beta,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, $\beta_0(x_\Delta) = x_\Delta$, and $\alpha_h(x)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$ with associated coefficients $\{c_{\alpha,i,j}, i, j \in Z^+\}$, it follows from Observation 6 that $Q_h(x) \triangleq q_h\big(q_h(x)\big)$ is a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $Q_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{Q,i,j}h^i(x-x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,

$$c_{Q,0,0} = c_{q,0,0} = (\Delta-2)^{-1};$$

$$c_{Q,0,1} = c_{q,0,1}c_{q,0,1} = (-1)(-1) = 1;$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{Q,0,2} &= c_{q,0,1}c_{q,0,2} + c_{q,0,2}c_{q,0,1}^2 \\
&= (-1)\Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big) + \Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big)(-1)^2 \quad = \quad 0;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{Q,0,3} &= c_{q,0,1}c_{q,0,3} + 2c_{q,0,2}c_{q,0,1}c_{q,0,2} + c_{q,0,3}c_{q,0,1}^3 \\
&= (-1)\Big(- \frac{(2\Delta-1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2}\Big) + 2\Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big)(-1)\Big(\frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)}{2(\Delta-1)}\Big) + \Big(- \frac{(2\Delta-1)\Delta(\Delta-2)^2}{6(\Delta-1)^2}\Big)(-1)^3 \\
&= \frac{\Delta(\Delta-2)^3}{6(\Delta-1)^2};
\end{aligned}$$

$$c_{Q,1,0} \quad = \quad c_{q,1,0} + c_{q,0,1}c_{q,1,0} \quad = \quad \kappa_0 + (-1)\kappa_0 \quad = \quad 0;$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{Q,1,1} &= c_{q,0,1}c_{q,1,1} + 2c_{q,0,2}c_{q,1,0}c_{q,0,1} + c_{q,1,1}c_{q,0,1} \\ &= 2c_{q,1,1}c_{q,0,1} + 2c_{q,0,2}c_{q,1,0}c_{q,0,1} \\ &= -2(c_{q,1,1} + c_{q,0,2}c_{q,1,0}) \\ &= -\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1}c_{f_0,1,0} + \frac{\Delta}{\Delta-2}c_{f_1,1,0} - 2\kappa_1; \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{Q,2,0} &= c_{q,2,0} + c_{q,0,1}c_{q,2,0} + c_{q,0,2}c_{q,1,0}^2 + c_{q,1,1}c_{q,1,0} \\ &= c_{q,2,0} + (-1)c_{q,2,0} + c_{q,1,0}(c_{q,0,2}c_{q,1,0} + c_{q,1,1}) \quad = \quad \kappa_0(c_{q,1,1} + c_{q,0,2}c_{q,1,0}) \quad = \quad -\frac{1}{2}c_{Q,1,1}\kappa_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $r_h(x) = Q_h(x) - x$, it follows that $r_h(x)$ is also a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $r_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{r,i,j}h^i(x - x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore,

$$c_{r,0,0} \quad = \quad c_{Q,0,0} - x_\Delta \quad = \quad 0,$$

$$c_{r,0,1} \quad = \quad c_{Q,0,1} - 1 \quad = \quad 0,$$

and $c_{r,i,j} = c_{Q,i,j}$ for all other $i, j \in Z^+$. Differentiating $r_h(x)$, we find that $r'_h(x)$ is also a jointly real analytic function of h, x at $(0, x_\Delta)$, where it has the expansion $r'_h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{r',i,j}h^i(x - x_\Delta)^j$. Furthermore, we find that $c_{r',i,j} = (j+1)c_{r,i,j+1}$ for all $i, j, \in Z^+$, completing the proof. ☐

9.2. *Proof of Lemma 6.*

Proof of Lemma 6. Let $G_h(x,y) \triangleq \big(x - g_h(y)f_h^{\Delta-1}(x)\big)^2 + \big(y - g_h(x)f_h^{\Delta-1}(y)\big)^2$, and note that (x,y) satisifes the s.o.e. (6) - (7) iff $G_h(x,y) = 0$. Let S^h denote the set of all $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{+\ 2}$ s.t. $G_h(x,y) = 0$. It follows from (9) - (10) that there exist $\epsilon_1, M_1 \in (0,\infty)$, depending only on $\mathbf{c}$ (but not on h), s.t.

$$h \in [0,\epsilon_1], (x,y) \in S^h \text{ implies } M_1^{-1} < x, y < M_1. \tag{41}$$

Using the identity $a^2 - b^2 = (a+b)(a-b)$, we find that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\big|G_h(x,y) - G_0(x,y)\big|$ is at most

$$\Big|2x - g_h(y)f_h^{\Delta-1}(x) - g_0(y)f_0^{\Delta-1}(x)\Big|\Big|g_h(y)f_h^{\Delta-1}(x) - g_0(y)f_0^{\Delta-1}(x)\Big| \tag{42}$$

$$+ \quad \Big|2y - g_h(x)f_h^{\Delta-1}(y) - g_0(x)f_0^{\Delta-1}(y)\Big|\Big|g_h(x)f_h^{\Delta-1}(y) - g_0(x)f_0^{\Delta-1}(y)\Big|. \tag{43}$$

It follows from (9) - (10) and (41) that there exist $\epsilon_2, M_2 \in (0,\infty)$, depending only on $\mathbf{c}$, s.t.

$$h \in [0,\epsilon_2], (x,y) \in S^h \text{ implies } \Big|2x - g_h(y)f_h^{\Delta-1}(x) - g_0(y)f_0^{\Delta-1}(x)\Big|, \Big|2y - g_h(x)f_h^{\Delta-1}(y) - g_0(x)f_0^{\Delta-1}(y)\Big| < M_2. \tag{44}$$

Using the identity $ab - cd = \frac{1}{2}\big((a-c)(b+d) + (b-d)(a+c)\big)$, we find that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\Big|g_h(y)f_h^{\Delta-1}(x) - g_0(y)f_0^{\Delta-1}(x)\Big|$ is at most

$$\Big|f_h^{\Delta-1}(x) + f_0^{\Delta-1}(x)\Big|\Big|g_h(y) - g_0(y)\Big| + \Big|g_h(y) + g_0(y)\Big|\Big|f_h^{\Delta-1}(x) - f_0^{\Delta-1}(x)\Big|; \tag{45}$$

and $\Big|g_h(x)f_h^{\Delta-1}(y) - g_0(x)f_0^{\Delta-1}(y)\Big|$ is at most

$$\Big|f_h^{\Delta-1}(y) + f_0^{\Delta-1}(y)\Big|\Big|g_h(x) - g_0(x)\Big| + \Big|g_h(x) + g_0(x)\Big|\Big|f_h^{\Delta-1}(y) - f_0^{\Delta-1}(y)\Big|. \tag{46}$$

It may be easily verified, using (9) - (10), that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on $\mathbf{c}$ and ϵ, s.t.

$$\max_{\substack{h\in[0,\delta_\epsilon] \\ x\in[M_1^{-1},M_1]}} \Big|g_h(x) - g_0(x)\Big| < \epsilon, \quad \max_{\substack{h\in[0,\delta_\epsilon] \\ x\in[M_1^{-1},M_1]}} \Big|f_h^{\Delta-1}(x) - f_0^{\Delta-1}(x)\Big| < \epsilon. \tag{47}$$

Using (44) to bound the first terms of both (42) and (43), and (9) - (10) and (45) - (47) to bound the second terms of both (42) and (43), we conclude that for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta'_\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$, depending only on $\mathbf{c}$ and ϵ, s.t.

$$h \in [0, \delta'_\epsilon], (x, y) \in S^h \text{ implies } \big|G_0(x, y)\big| < \epsilon. \tag{48}$$

For $\epsilon > 0$, let

$$S_\epsilon \triangleq \Big\{(x, y) \in [M_1^{-1}, M_1]^2 \text{ s.t. } |x - x_\Delta| > \epsilon \text{ or } |y - x_\Delta| > \epsilon\Big\},$$

and note that S_ϵ depends only on $\mathbf{c}$ and ϵ. Since $(x, y) = x_\Delta\mathbf{1}$ is the unique solution to $G_0(x, y) = 0$ over the compact set $[M_1^{-1}, M_1]^2$, and G_0 is continuous on $[M_1^{-1}, M_1]^2$, it follows that for all sufficiently small strictly positive ϵ, $[M_1^{-1}, M_1]^2 \setminus S_\epsilon$ is non-empty, and

$$\min_{(x,y)\in[M_1^{-1},M_1]^2\setminus S_\epsilon} G_0(x, y) > 0. \tag{49}$$

Combining (48) and (49) completes the proof. □

9.3. *Proof of Lemma 7.*

Proof of Lemma 7. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} i^k \Lambda_{\Delta,i} &= \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} i^k \binom{\Delta}{i} (\frac{1}{\Delta-2})^i \\ &= (1 - \frac{1}{\Delta-1})^{-\Delta} \sum_{i=0}^{\Delta} i^k \binom{\Delta}{i} (\frac{1}{\Delta-1})^i (1 - \frac{1}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-i}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $B = B(n, p)$ denote a binomially distributed r.v. with parameters n, p. It is well-known that $E[B] = np, E[B^2] = np(1-p+np)$, and $E[B^3] = np(1-3p+3np+2p^2-3np^2+n^2p^2)$. Combining the above, and simplifying all relevant expressions, completes the proof. □

9.4. *Proof of Corollary 3.*

Proof of Corollary 3. By repeatedly applying Lemma 7 and simplifying, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i &= (\Delta-2)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+(6-5\Delta)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+2(\Delta-1)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i^2\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\\ &= -(\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta-1};\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i i &= (\Delta-2)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+(6-5\Delta)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i^2\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+2(\Delta-1)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i^3\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\\ &= \Delta(\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta-1};\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^k &= \tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k\big(4-(k-1)\Delta^2\big)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)k-\Delta^2\big)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+\Delta^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\delta_{i,k}\\ &= (2\Delta^2)^{-1}\Lambda_{\Delta,k}(\Delta+2-\Delta k);\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^k i &= \tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k\big(4-(k-1)\Delta^2\big)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_k\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)k-\Delta^2\big)\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i^2\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+\Delta^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\delta_{i,k}\\ &= (2\Delta)^{-1}\big(k\Delta-(\Delta+2)\big)\Lambda_{\Delta,k};\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^+ &= -\frac{\Delta+2}{2\Delta^2}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+(2\Delta)^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\\ &= -(2\Delta^2)^{-1}(\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta-1};\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^+ i &= -\frac{\Delta+2}{2\Delta^2}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i\Lambda_{\Delta,i}+(2\Delta)^{-1}\sum_{i=0}^{\Delta}i^2\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\\ &= (2\Delta)^{-1}(\frac{\Delta-1}{\Delta-2})^{\Delta-1};\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^k &= \Lambda_{\Delta,i}\big(2\Delta^2(\Delta-2)\lambda_\Delta\big)^{-1}\left((4+\Delta^2-\Delta^2 i)\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,k}+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)i-\Delta^2\big)\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,k}k\right)\\ &\quad+\Delta^{-1}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\delta_{i,k}\\ &= \Lambda_{\Delta,i}(2\Delta^2)^{-1}(\Delta+2-\Delta i);\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta} k\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^k &= \Lambda_{\Delta,i}\big(2\Delta^2(\Delta-2)\lambda_\Delta\big)^{-1}\Bigg((4+\Delta^2-\Delta^2 i)\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,k}k+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)i-\Delta^2\big)\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}\Lambda_{\Delta,k}k^2\Bigg)\\ &\quad +\Delta^{-1}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta}k\delta_{i,k}\\ &= \Lambda_{\Delta,i}(2\Delta)^{-1}\big(\Delta i-(\Delta+2)\big).\end{aligned}$$

□

9.5. *Proof of Lemma 8.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 8. We first prove that $\Big(\mathcal{T}\cdot\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\Big)_{k,i}=\mathcal{U}_{k,i}$ for $k\in\{1,\dots,\Delta-2\}$, and $i\in\{0,\dots,\Delta\}$. Indeed, let us fix some $k\in\{1,\dots,\Delta-2\}$, and $i\in\{0,\dots,\Delta\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\mathcal{T}\cdot\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\Big)_{k,i} &= \big(-\Delta\Lambda_{\Delta,k-1}^{-1}\big)\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_{k-1}\Big(4-(k-2)\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)(k-1)-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,k-1}\Bigg)\\ &\quad +\big(2\Delta\Lambda_{\Delta,k}^{-1}\big)\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_{k}\Big(4-(k-1)\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)k-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,k}\Bigg)\\ &\quad +\big(-\Delta\Lambda_{\Delta,k+1}^{-1}\big)\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_{k+1}\Big(4-k\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)(k+1)-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,k+1}\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta\Lambda_{\Delta,j}^{-1}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_j=\big(2\Delta(\Delta-2)\lambda_\Delta\big)^{-1}$, it then follows from a straightforward calculation that

$$\Big(\mathcal{T}\cdot\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\Big)_{k,i}=-\delta_{i,k-1}+2\delta_{i,k}-\delta_{i,k+1} \quad=\quad \mathcal{U}_{k,i},$$

completing the proof.

We now treat the cases $k=\Delta-1$ and $k=\Delta$. Let us fix some $i\in\{0,\dots,\Delta\}$. Then $\Big(\mathcal{T}\cdot\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\Big)_{\Delta-1,i}$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-3}\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\Delta-2)^{\Delta}(\Delta+j)\Big)\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_j\Big(4-(j-1)\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)j-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,j}\Bigg)\\ &+\Bigg(\frac{(\Delta-2)^{\Delta-2}}{\Delta-1}(\Delta^4-6\Delta^3+13\Delta^2-12\Delta+2)\Bigg)\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_{\Delta-2}\Big(4-(\Delta-3)\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)(\Delta-2)-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,\Delta-2}\Bigg)\\ &+\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\Delta-2)^{\Delta-1}(2\Delta^2-5\Delta+6)\Big)\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_{\Delta-1}\Big(4-(\Delta-2)\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)(\Delta-1)-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,\Delta-1}\Bigg)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&=\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\frac{(\Delta-2)^{\Delta}}{4\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}\Bigg(2(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}\big(\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-3}(\Delta+j)\delta_{i,j}-(\Delta+i)\big)+\frac{2(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}{\Delta-2}(2\Delta^2-5\Delta+6)\delta_{i,\Delta-1}\\ &\qquad+\frac{4(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-2}}{(\Delta-2)^2}(\Delta^4-6\Delta^3+13\Delta^2-12\Delta+2)\delta_{i,\Delta-2}\Bigg),\end{aligned}\tag{50}$$

and $\Big(\mathcal{T}\cdot\tilde{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\Big)_{\Delta,i}$ equals

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1}\Big(-\Delta(\Delta-1)(\Delta-j)(2j+\Delta-3)\Big)\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\bigg(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}}_j\Big(4-(j-1)\Delta^2+\big((\Delta^2-2\Delta+2)j-\Delta^2\big)i\Big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,j}\bigg)$$

$$= \Lambda_{\Delta,i}\bigg((\Delta^3-4\Delta^2+4\Delta-2)+(\Delta^2-3\Delta+3)i-(\Delta-1)\sum_{j=0}^{\Delta-1}(\Delta-j)(2j+\Delta-3)\delta_{i,j}\bigg); \tag{51}$$

where both (50) and (51) follow from Lemma 3 and a tedious calculation (the details of which we omit). The remainder of the proof then follows from a straightforward case analysis. □

9.6. *Proof of Lemma 9.*

Proof of Lemma 9. Let us fix some $j \in \{0,\dots,\Delta\}$. It follows from Corollary 3 and a straightforward calculation that $-\frac{1}{2\Delta}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}(\Delta+k)\boldsymbol{\rho}_j^k$ equals

$$\Lambda_{\Delta,j}\bigg(\big(2\Delta^2(\Delta-1)^{\Delta}\big)^{-1}\Big(\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta}-\Delta^3-\Delta+2+(\Delta-1)^2\big(\Delta+(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-2}\big)j\Big)-(2\Delta^2)^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^{\Delta-1}(\Delta+k)\delta_{j,k}\bigg).$$

Alternatively, $\boldsymbol{\rho}_j^{\Delta}$ equals

$$\Lambda_{\Delta,j}\Big(\big(2\Delta^2(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}\big)^{-1}\big(-(\Delta^2+\Delta+2)+\Delta(\Delta-1)j\big)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{j,\Delta}\Big).$$

The remainder of the proof then follows from a straightforward case analysis. □

9.7. *Proof of Lemma 10.*

Proof of Lemma 10. Let us define a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1,\dots,\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1})$ by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j = \begin{cases} \tau_I^{\Delta} & j=\Delta+1; \\ 0 & j=\Delta; \\ \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(j-i)\big(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i+\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{+}+\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{0}\big) & j\in\{1,\dots,\Delta-1\}. \end{cases} \tag{52}$$

That $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ satisfies $(I),(II)$, and (A) follows from (35). We now show that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ satisfies (III) and (IV). It follows from Corollary 3 and a straightforward calculation that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-2} = \frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-2}}, \tag{53}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1} = \big(\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}\big)^{-1}. \tag{54}$$

Combining (53) and (54), it follows that $-\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-2}+2\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1}+\boldsymbol{\tau}_I^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}^{+}_{\Delta-1}+\boldsymbol{\rho}^{0}_{\Delta-1}$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}-\Big(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-2}}\Big)+2\Big(\big(\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}\big)^{-1}\Big)+\boldsymbol{\tau}_I^{\Delta}\Big((2\Delta^2)^{-1}\Lambda_{\Delta,\Delta-1}\big(-(\Delta+2)+\Delta(\Delta-1)\big)\Big)&\\ +\Big(\Lambda_{\Delta,\Delta-1}(2\Delta^2)^{-1}(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}(4+\Delta^2-\Delta^2(\Delta-1))\Big)&=0,\end{aligned}$$

verifying that (III) holds, and $-\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1}+\boldsymbol{\tau}_I^{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\rho}^{+}_{\Delta}+\boldsymbol{\rho}^{0}_{\Delta}$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}-\Big(\big(\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}\big)^{-1}\Big)+\boldsymbol{\tau}_I^{\Delta}\Big((2\Delta^2)^{-1}\Lambda_{\Delta,\Delta}\big(-(\Delta+2)+\Delta^2\big)\Big)&\\ +\Big(\Lambda_{\Delta,\Delta}(2\Delta^2)^{-1}(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}(4+\Delta^2-\Delta^3)\Big)&=0,\end{aligned}$$

verifying that (IV) holds.

We now show that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1,\ldots,\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta}\geq 0$, completing the proof. Note that for $i\in\{0,\ldots,\Delta-2\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i+\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1}\boldsymbol{\rho}^{+}_i+\boldsymbol{\rho}^{0}_i$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau_I^{\Delta}\Big((2\Delta^2)^{-1}\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\big(-(\Delta+2)+\Delta i\big)\Big)+\Big(\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Big((2\Delta^2)^{-1}(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}(4+\Delta^2-\Delta^2 i)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,0}\Big)\Big)\\ &=\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Big(\Delta^{-1}(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}(i-2)+\Delta^{-1}\delta_{i,0}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Thus for all $i\in\{2,\ldots,\Delta-2\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i+\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1}\boldsymbol{\rho}^{+}_i+\boldsymbol{\rho}^{0}_i\geq 0$. It follows from (36) that the sequence $\{\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{j+1}-\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j, j=1,\ldots,\Delta-2\}$ is monotone increasing. However, it follows from (53) and (54) that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1}-\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-2}&=\big(\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}\big)^{-1}-\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-2}}\\ &=-\frac{\Delta^2-3\Delta+1}{\Delta(\Delta-1)^{\Delta-1}}\leq 0,\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the easily-verified fact that $\Delta^2-3\Delta+1$ is non-negative for all $\Delta\geq 3$. Thus $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{j+1}-\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j\leq 0$ for all $j\in\{1,\ldots,\Delta-2\}$, or equivalently $\{\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j, j=1,\ldots,\Delta-1\}$ is monotone decreasing. As (54) implies that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1}\geq 0$, we conclude that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1,\ldots,\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta}\geq 0$, completing the proof. ☐

9.8. *Proof of Lemma 11.* Before completing the proof of Lemma 11, we prove an auxiliary lemma, demonstrating the non-negativity of certain functions of Δ.

Lemma 13.

$$2\Delta^3-11\Delta^2+19\Delta-11\geq 0 \text{ for all } \Delta\geq 3.$$

$$\max\Big(\frac{\Delta-2}{3\Delta-4},\frac{5\Delta-9}{14\Delta-18}\Big)\leq(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\leq\min\Big(\frac{1}{2},\frac{(\Delta-2)^2}{2\Delta^2-7\Delta+7},\frac{\Delta-2}{2\Delta-3},\frac{2\Delta-2}{5\Delta-4}\Big) \text{ for all } \Delta\geq 3.$$

$$(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\leq\frac{(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)(\Delta-3)}{2\Delta^3-11\Delta^2+19\Delta-11} \text{ for all } \Delta\geq 4.$$

Proof. It follows from elementary calculus that $\eta(x) \triangleq (\frac{x-1}{x})^x$ is an increasing function of x on $(1,\infty)$. The lemma then follows from a straightforward but tedious computation (the details of which we omit). $\square$

We now complete the proof of Lemma 11.

Proof of Lemma 11. Let us define a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{d}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1})$ by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_j = \begin{cases} -\tau_{II}^{\Delta} & j = \Delta+1; \\ (2\Delta^2)^{-1}\big(1 - 2(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\big) & j = \Delta; \\ \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(j-i)\big(\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i + \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{+} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{0}\big) & j \in \{1, \ldots, \Delta-1\}. \end{cases} \tag{55}$$

That $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ satisfies $(I), (II)$, and (A) follows from (35). We now show that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ satisfies (III) and (IV). It follows from Corollary 3 and a straightforward calculation that for all $\Delta \geq 3$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-2} = \big(\Delta(\Delta-2)^{\Delta-4}\big)^{-1}\left(1 - (\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\frac{2\Delta^2-7\Delta+7}{(\Delta-2)^2}\right), \tag{56}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1} = \big(\Delta(\Delta-2)^{\Delta-2}\big)^{-1}\left(1 - (\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\frac{2\Delta-3}{\Delta-2}\right). \tag{57}$$

That (III) and (IV) hold then follows from a straightforward but tedious computation (the details of which we omit).

We now show that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta} \geq 0$, completing the proof. Note that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_1 = 0 \quad \text{for all } \Delta \geq 3, \tag{58}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_2 = \Delta^{-1}\big((\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\frac{3\Delta-4}{\Delta-2} - 1\big) \quad \text{for all } \Delta \geq 3, \tag{59}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_3 = \frac{5\Delta-9}{2\Delta(\Delta-2)}\big((\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\frac{14\Delta-18}{5\Delta-9} - 1\big) \quad \text{for all } \Delta \geq 4. \tag{60}$$

Also, for all $\Delta \geq 7$ and $i \in \{5, \ldots, \Delta-2\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i + \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{+} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{0}$ equals

$$\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\big(\Delta^2(\Delta-2)\big)^{-1}\left(\Delta(\Delta-2)+(\Delta-1)\big((5\Delta-6)(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta}-3(\Delta-2)\big)i+(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)\big(1-2(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\big)i^2\right). \tag{61}$$

It follows from Lemma 13 that for all $\Delta \geq 7$ and $i \geq 5$,

$$(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)\big(1-2(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\big)i^2 \geq 5(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)\big(1-2(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\big)i.$$

Combining with (61) and Lemma 13, we conclude that for all $\Delta \geq 7$ and $i \in \{5,\ldots,\Delta-2\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta}\boldsymbol{\pi}_i + \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta+1}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{+} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_i^{0}$ is at least

$$\Lambda_{\Delta,i}\Delta^{-2}\Bigg(\Delta + 2(\Delta-1)\Big(1-(\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\frac{5\Delta-4}{2\Delta-2}\Big)i\Bigg) \quad \geq \quad 0.$$

Combining with (36), we find that for all $\Delta \geq 7$, the sequence $\{\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{i+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i, i = 4,\ldots,\Delta-2\}$ is monotone increasing. However, it follows from (56) and (57) that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-2}$ equals

$$\frac{(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)(\Delta-3)}{\Delta(\Delta-2)^{\Delta-1}}\Bigg((\frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1})^{\Delta-1}\frac{2\Delta^3-11\Delta^2+19\Delta-11}{(\Delta-1)(\Delta-2)(\Delta-3)} - 1\Bigg) \quad \leq \quad 0, \tag{62}$$

with the final inequality following from Lemma 13. Thus for all $\Delta \geq 7$ and $i \in \{4,\ldots,\Delta-2\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{i+1} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i \leq 0$, or equivalently $\{\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_i, i = 4,\ldots,\Delta-1\}$ is monotone decreasing. As it follows from (57) and Lemma 13 that $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1} \geq 0$ for all $\Delta \geq 3$, we conclude that for all $\Delta \geq 7$, $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_4,\ldots,\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\Delta-1} \geq 0$. Combining with (55) - (60) and Lemma 13 completes the proof. $\square$

REFERENCES

[1] D. Achlioptas and A. Coja-Oghlan, *Algorithmic barriers from phase transitions*, Foundations of Computer Science, 2008. FOCS'08. IEEE 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on, IEEE, 2008, pp. 793–802.

[2] K. Ramanan B. Luen and I. Ziedins, *Nonmonotonicity of phase transitions in a loss network with controls*, Annals of Applied Probability **16** (2006), no. 3, 1528 – 1562.

[3] A. Bandyopadhyay and D. Gamarnik, *Counting without sampling. new algorithms for enumeration problems using statistical physics*, Random Structures and Algorithms **33** (2008), no. 4.

[4] N.C. Bartelt and T.L. Einstein, *Triangular lattice gas with first-and second-neighbor exclusions: Continuous transition in the four-state Potts universality class*, Physical Review B **30** (1984), no. 9, 5339.

[5] M. Bayati, D. Gamarnik, and P. Tetali, *Combinatorial approach to the interpolation method and scaling limits in sparse random graphs*, Proceedings of the 42nd ACM symposium on Theory of computing, ACM, 2010, pp. 105–114.

[6] A. Bellemans and R. K. Nigam, *Phase transitions in the hard-square lattice gas*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16** (1966), 1038–1039.

[7] I. Benjamini and O. Schramm, *Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs*, arXiv preprint math/0011019 (2000).

[8] J. Besag, *Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems*, Journal of the royal statistical society, series B **36** (1974), no. 2, 192 – 236.

[9] G. Biroli and M. Mézard, *Lattice glass models*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2001), 025501.

[10] T. Bodineau and C. Toninelli, *Activity phase transition for constrained dynamics*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **311** (2012), 357–396, 10.1007/s00220-012-1449-4.

[11] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan, *Sparse graphs: metrics and random models*, Random Structures & Algorithms **39** (2010), no. 1, 1–38.

[12] C. Bordenave, M. Lelarge, and J. Salez, *Matchings on infinite graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1102.0712 (2011).

[13] C. Borgs, J. Chayes, J. Kahn, and L. Lovász, *Left and right convergence of graphs with bounded degree*, Random Structures & Algorithms (2010).

[14] C. Borgs, JT Chayes, and D. Randall, *The van den Berg-Kesten-Reimer inequality: a review*, Perplexing Problems in Probability: Festschrift in Honor of Harry Kesten (1998), 159–173.

[15] C. Brandt, N. Immorlica, G. Kamath, and R. Kleinberg, *An analysis of one-dimensional Schelling segregation*, Proceedings of the 44th symposium on Theory of Computing (New York, NY, USA), STOC '12, ACM, 2012, pp. 789–804.

[16] W. Brendel and S. Todorovic, *Segmentation as maximum-weight independent set*, Proceedings of 24th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS), 2010.

[17] G.R. Brightwell and P. Winkler, *Graph homomorphisms and phase transitions*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **77** (1999), no. 2, 221 – 262.

[18] D.M. Burley, *A lattice model of a classical hard sphere gas*, Proceedings of the Physical Society **75** (1960), no. 2, 262.

[19] J.Y. Cai, X. Chen, and H. Guo, *Inapproximability after uniqueness phase transition in two-spin systems*, preprint (2012).

[20] N. Cancrini, F. Martinelli, C. Roberto, and C. Toninelli, *Kinetically constrained spin models*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **140** (2008), 459–504, 10.1007/s00440-007-0072-3.

[21] V. Chandrasekaran, M. Chertkov, D. Gamarnik, D. Shah, and J. Shin, *Counting independent sets using the Bethe approximation*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics **25** (2011), no. 2, 1012–1034.

[22] S.C. Chang and R. Shrock, *Ground-state entropy of the Potts antiferromagnet with next-nearest-neighbor spin-spin couplings on strips of the square lattice*, Physical Review E **62** (2000), no. 4, 4650.

[23] A. Coja-Oghlan and C. Efthymiou, *On independent sets in random graphs*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '11, SIAM, 2011, pp. 136–144.

[24] T.J. Colin, *Local properties of an Ising model on a Cayley tree*, Journal of Statistical Physics **27** (1982), 441–456, 10.1007/BF01011085.

[25] G. M. Constantine and T. H. Savits, *A multivariate faa di bruno formula with applications*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **348** (1996), no. 2, pp. 503–520 (English).

[26] E. Csóka, *Local algorithms with public randomisation on sparse graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1202.1565 (2012).

[27] K. Ramanan D. Galvin, F. Martinelli and P. Tetali, *The finite-state hard core model on a regular tree*, SIAM Jour. Discrete Math. **25** (2011), no. 2, 894 – 915.

[28] L. Dall'Asta, P. Pin, and A. Ramezanpour, *Statistical mechanics of maximal independent sets*, Phys. Rev. E **80** (2009), 061136.

[29] L. DallAsta, P. Pin, and A. Ramezanpour, *Optimal equilibria of the best shot game*, Journal of Public Economic Theory **13** (2011), no. 6, 885–901.

[30] C. Daly, *Higher order models using entropy, Markov random fields and sequential simulation*, Geostatistics Banff 2004 (2005), 215–224.

[31] A. Dembo and A. Montanari, *Ising models on locally tree-like graphs*, The Annals of Applied Probability **20** (2010), no. 2, 565–592.

[32] A. Dembo, A. Montanari, A. Sly, and N. Sun, *The replica symmetric solution for Potts models on d-regular graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.5500 (2012).

[33] D. Dereudre, R. Drouilhet, and H. Georgii, *Existence of Gibbsian point processes with geometry-dependent interactions*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **153** (2012), 643–670, 10.1007/s00440-011-0356-5.

[34] R.L. Dobrushin and S.B. Shlosman, Birkhauser, 1985.

[35] C. Domb, *On the theory of cooperative phenomena in crystals*, Advances in Physics **9** (1960), no. 35, 245–361.

[36] M. Dyer, L. Goldberg, and M. Jerrum, *A complexity dichotomy for hypergraph partition functions*, Computational Complexity **19** (2010), 605–633, 10.1007/s00037-010-0300-6.

[37] E.Ising, *Beitrag zur theorie des ferro- und paramagnetismus*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Hamburg (1924).

[38] G. Elek and G. Lippner, *Borel oracles. an analytical approach to constant-time algorithms*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc, vol. 138, 2010, pp. 2939–2947.

[39] J.W. Essam, J.C. Lin, and P.L. Taylor, *Potts model on the Bethe lattice with mixed interactions*, Physical Review E **52** (1995), no. 1, 44.

[40] CM Fortuin, PW Kasteleyn, and J. Ginibre, *Correlation inequalities on some partially ordered sets*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **22** (1971), no. 2, 89–103.

[41] G.H. Fredrickson and H.C. Andersen, *Kinetic Ising model of the glass transition*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53** (1984), 1244–1247.

[42] W.T. Freeman, *Where computer vision needs help from computer science*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SIAM, 2011, pp. 814–819.

[43] A. Galanis, Q. Ge, D. tefankovi, E. Vigoda, and L. Yang, *Improved inapproximability results for counting independent sets in the hard-core model*, Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (Leslie Goldberg, Klaus Jansen, R. Ravi, and Jose Rolim, eds.), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6845, Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 567–578.

[44] D. Gamarnik, *Right-convergence of sparse random graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1202.3123 (2012).

[45] D. Gamarnik and D.A. Goldberg, *Randomized greedy algorithms for independent sets and matchings in regular graphs: Exact results and finite girth corrections*, Comb. Probab. Comput. **19**, no. 1, 61–85.

[46] D. Gamarnik, D.A. Goldberg, and T. Weber, *PTAS for maximum weight independent set problem with random weights in bounded degree graphs*, Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (Philadelphia, PA, USA), SODA '10, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010, pp. 268–278.

[47] D. Gamarnik, D.A. Goldberg, and T. Weber, *Correlation decay in random decision networks*, Preprint (2012).

[48] D. Gamarnik, T. Nowicki, and G. Swirszcz, *Maximum weight independent sets and matchings in sparse random graphs. exact results using the local weak convergence method*, Random Struct. Algorithms **28** (2006), no. 1, 76–106.

[49] N. Ganikhodjaev, H. Akın, S. Uğuz, and S. Temir, *Phase diagram and extreme Gibbs measures of the Ising model on a Cayley tree in the presence of competing binary and ternary interactions*, Phase Transitions **84** (2011), no. 11-12, 1045–1063.

[50] N. Ganikhodjaev, F. Mukhamedov, and C.H. Pah, *Phase diagram of the three states Potts model with next nearest neighbour interactions on the Bethe lattice*, Physics Letters A **373** (2008), no. 1, 33–38.

[51] N. Ganikhodjaev, S. Temir, and H. Akin, *Modulated phase of a Potts model with competing binary interactions on a Cayley tree*, Journal of Statistical Physics **137** (2009), no. 4, 701–715.

[52] NN Ganikhodjaev, H. Akin, and S. Temir, *Potts model with two competing binary interactions*, Turk. J. Math **31** (2007), 229–238.

[53] D.S. Gaunt and M.E. Fisher, *Hard-sphere lattice gases. i. plane-square lattice*, The Journal of Chemical Physics **43** (1965), no. 8, 2840–2863.

[54] D. Geiger, C. Meek, and B. Sturmfels, *On the toric algebra of graphical models*, The Annals of Statistics **34** (2006), no. 3, 1463–1492.

[55] H.O. Georgii, *Gibbs measures and phase transitions*, vol. 9, Walter de Gruyter, 2011.

[56] GR Grimmett, *A theorem about random fields*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society **5** (1973), no. 1, 81–84.

[57] M. Haenggi, J.G. Andrews, F. Baccelli, O. Dousse, and M. Franceschetti, *Stochastic geometry and random graphs for the analysis and design of wireless networks*, IEEE J.Sel. A. Commun. **27** (2009), no. 7, 1029–1046.

[58] J.M. Hammersley and P. Clifford, *Markov fields on finite graphs and lattices*, (1968).

[59] H. Hatami, L. Lovász, and B. Szegedy, *Limits of local-global convergent graph sequences*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.4356 (2012).

[60] H. Hatami and M. Molloy, *Sharp thresholds for constraint satisfaction problems and homomorphisms*, Random Structures & Algorithms **33** (2008), no. 3, 310–332.

[61] T. Hellings, S.C. Borst, and J.S.H. van Leeuwaarden, *Tandem queueing networks with neighbor blocking and back-offs*, Queueing Systems **68** (2011), no. 3, 321–331.

[62] H. Ishikawa, *Higher-order clique reduction in binary graph cut*, Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2009. CVPR 2009. IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2009, pp. 2993–3000.

[63] D. Joseph, J. Meidanis, and P. Tiwari, *Determining dna sequence similarity using maximum independent set algorithms for interval graphs*, Algorithm TheorySWAT'92 (1992), 326–337.

[64] I. Ziedins K. Ramanan, A. Senhupta and P. Mitra, *Markov random fields of multicasting in tree networks*, Annals of Applied Probability **34** (2002), no. 1, 58 – 84.

[65] F. P. Kelly, *Stochastic models of computer communication systems*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological) **47** (1985), no. 3, pp. 379–395 (English).

[66] ———, *Loss networks*, The Annals of Applied Probability **1** (1991), no. 3, pp. 319–378 (English).

[67] Valery Van Kerrebroeck, *Dynamical behavior of the Biroli-Mezard model*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series **40** (2006), no. 1, 59.

[68] W. Kob and H.C. Andersen, *Kinetic lattice-gas model of cage effects in high-density liquids and a test of mode-coupling theory of the ideal-glass transition*, Phys Rev E Stat Phys Plasmas Fluids Relat Interdiscip Topics **48** (1993), no. 6, 4364–4377.

[69] P. Kohli, M.P. Kumar, and P.H.S. Torr, *P3 & beyond: Solving energies with higher order cliques*, Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2007. CVPR'07. IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2007, pp. 1–8.

[70] P. Kohli, L. Ladickỳ, and P.H.S. Torr, *Robust higher order potentials for enforcing label consistency*, International Journal of Computer Vision **82** (2009), no. 3, 302–324.

[71] N. Komodakis and N. Paragios, *Beyond pairwise energies: Efficient optimization for higher-order mrfs*, Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2009. CVPR 2009. IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2009, pp. 2985–2992.

[72] F. Krzakała, A. Montanari, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, G. Semerjian, and L. Zdeborová, *Gibbs states and the set of solutions of random constraint satisfaction problems*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **104** (2007), no. 25, 10318–10323.

[73] F. Krzakala, M. Tarzia, and L. Zdeborová, *Lattice model for colloidal gels and glasses*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008), 165702.

[74] X. Lan, S. Roth, D. Huttenlocher, and M. Black, *Efficient belief propagation with learned higher-order Markov random fields*, Computer Vision–ECCV 2006 (2006), 269–282.

[75] DP Landau, *Critical and multicritical behavior in a triangular-lattice-gas Ising model: Repulsive nearest-neighbor and attractive next-nearest-neighbor coupling*, Physical Review B **27** (1983), no. 9, 5604.

[76] M. Lelarge, *A new approach to the orientation of random hypergraphs*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '12, SIAM, 2012, pp. 251–264.

[77] A.L.M. Levada, N.D.A. Mascarenhas, and A. Tannús, *Pseudo-likelihood equations for Potts model on higher-order neighborhood systems: A quantitative approach for parameter estimation in image analysis*, Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics **23** (2009), no. 2, 120–140.

[78] L. Li, P. Lu, and Y. Yin, *Approximate counting via correlation decay in spin systems*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '12, SIAM, 2012, pp. 922–940.

[79] S.Z. Li, *Markov random field modeling in image analysis*, Springer, 2009.

[80] L. Lovász, *Large networks and graph limits*, 2012.

[81] R. Lyons and F. Nazarov, *Perfect matchings as iid factors on non-amenable groups*, European Journal of Combinatorics **32** (2011), no. 7, 1115 – 1125, ¡ce:title¿Homomorphisms and Limits¡/ce:title¿.

[82] F. Martinelli, A. Sinclair, and D. Weitz, *Fast mixing for independent sets, colorings, and other models on trees*, Random Structures & Algorithms **31** (2007), no. 2, 134–172.

[83] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and R. Zecchina, *Analytic and algorithmic solution of random satisfiability problems*, Science **297** (2002), no. 5582, 812–815.

[84] Marc Mézard and Marco Tarzia, *Statistical mechanics of the hitting set problem*, Phys. Rev. E **76** (2007), 041124.

[85] A. Montanari, E. Mossel, and A. Sly, *The weak limit of Ising models on locally tree-like graphs*, Probability Theory and Related Fields (2012), 1–21.

[86] R. Morris, *Auxiliary variables for Markov random fields with higher order interactions*, Energy Minimization Methods in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Springer, 1999, pp. 731–731.

[87] E. Mossel, D. Weitz, and N. Wormald, *On the hardness of sampling independent sets beyond the tree threshold*, Probability Theory and Related Fields **143** (2009), 401–439, 10.1007/s00440-007-0131-9.

[88] D.S Johnson M.R Garey, *Computers and intractability*, 1979.

[89] C. Nair and P. Tetali, *The correlation decay (cd) tree and strong spatial mixing in multi-spin systems*, arXiv preprint math/0701494 (2007).

[90] C.M. Newman, *Asymptotic independence and limit theorems for positively and negatively dependent random variables*, Lecture Notes-Monograph Series (1984), 127–140.

[91] T. Norberg, L. Rosen, A. Baran, and S. Baran, *On modelling discrete geological structures as Markov random fields*, Mathematical Geology **34** (2002), no. 1, 63–77.

[92] P. Olofsson, *Branching processes with local dependencies*, The Annals of Applied Probability **6** (1996), no. 1, 238–268.

[93] R. Paget and I.D. Longstaff, *Texture synthesis via a noncausal nonparametric multiscale Markov random field*, Image Processing, IEEE Transactions on **7** (1998), no. 6, 925–931.

[94] G. Parisi and F. Zamponi, *Mean-field theory of hard sphere glasses and jamming*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82** (2010), 789–845.

[95] R. Pemantle, *Towards a theory of negative dependence*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **41** (2000), no. 3, 1371–1390.

[96] F.H. Ree and D.A. Chesnut, *Phase transition of a hard-core lattice gas. the square lattice with nearest-neighbor exclusion*, The Journal of Chemical Physics **45** (1966), no. 11, 3983–4003.

[97] O. Rivoire, G. Biroli, O.C. Martin, and M. Mezard, *Glass models on Bethe lattices*, The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems **37** (2003), 55–78, 10.1140/epjb/e2004-00030-4.

[98] S. Roth and M.J. Black, *Fields of experts*, International Journal of Computer Vision **82** (2009), no. 2, 205–229.

[99] L. K. Runnels and L. L. Combs, *Exact finite method of lattice statistics. i. square and triangular lattice gases of hard molecules*, The Journal of Chemical Physics **45** (1966), no. 7, 2482–2492.

[100] L.K. Runnels, *Phase transition of a Bethe lattice gas of hard molecules*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **8** (1967), no. 10, 2081–2087.

[101] J. Salez, *The cavity method for counting spanning subgraphs subject to local constraints*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1103.3281 (2011).

[102] D. Shah, J. Shin, and P. Tetali, *Medium access using queues*, Proceedings of FOCS 2011, 2011.

[103] D. Sherrington, *Physics and complexity*, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences **368** (2010), no. 1914, 1175–1189.

[104] J. Shin, *Complexity of Bethe approximation*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.1724 (2011).

[105] A. Sinclair, P. Srivastava, and M. Thurley, *Approximation algorithms for two-state anti-ferromagnetic spin systems on bounded degree graphs*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA '12, SIAM, 2012, pp. 941–953.

[106] A. Sly, *Computational transition at the uniqueness threshold*, Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2010 51st Annual IEEE Symposium on, oct. 2010, pp. 287 –296.

[107] A. Sly and N. Sun, *The computational hardness of counting in two-spin models on d-regular graphs*, preprint (2012).

[108] H N V Temperley, *Application of the Mayer method to the melting problem*, Proceedings of the Physical Society **74** (1959), no. 2, 183.

[109] ———, *Improvements in the lattice model of a liquid*, Proceedings of the Physical Society **77** (1961), no. 3, 630.

[110] ———, *Statistics of a two-dimensional lattice gas. i*, Proceedings of the Physical Society **80** (1962), no. 4, 813.

[111] H. Tjelmeland and J. Besag, *Markov random fields with higher-order interactions*, Scandinavian Journal of Statistics **25** (2001), no. 3, 415–433.

[112] J. van den Berg and A. Gandolfi, *BK-type inequalities and generalized random-cluster representations*, Probability Theory and Related Fields (2012), 1–25.

[113] J. Van Den Berg and H. Kesten, *Inequalities with applications to percolation and reliability*, Journal of applied probability (1985), 556–569.

[114] J. van den Berg and J.E. Steif, *Percolation and the hard-core lattice gas model*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **49** (1994), no. 2, 179 – 197.

[115] J. Vannimenus, *Modulated phase of an Ising system with competing interactions on a Cayley tree*, Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter **43** (1981), no. 2, 141–148.

[116] E. Vigoda, *Improved bounds for sampling colorings*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **41** (2000), 1555.

[117] M.J. Wainwright and M.I. Jordan, *Graphical models, exponential families, and variational inference*, Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning **1** (2008), no. 1-2, 1–305.

[118] M. Weigt and A. K. Hartmann, *Glassy behavior induced by geometrical frustration in a hard-core lattice-gas model*, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **62** (2003), no. 4, 533.

[119] D. Weitz, *Mixing in time and space for discrete spin systems*, Ph.D. thesis, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, 2004.

[120] ———, *Combinatorial criteria for uniqueness of Gibbs measures*, Random Structures and Algorithms **27** (2005), no. 4, 445–475.

[121] D. Weitz, *Counting independent sets up to the tree threshold*, Proceedings of the 38th ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC), 2006.

[122] N. Wormald, *Models of random regular graphs.*, Surveys in Combinatorics **276** (1999), 239–298.

[123] F.Y. Wu, *The Potts model*, Reviews of modern physics **54** (1982), no. 1, 235.

[124] Y. Yin and C. Zhang, *Approximate counting via correlation decay on planar graphs*, preprint (2012).

[125] S. Zachary, *Countable state space Markov random fields and Markov chains on trees*, The Annals of Probability **11**, no. 4, pp. 894–903.

[126] ———, *Bounded, attractive and repulsive Markov specifications on trees and on the one-dimensional lattice*, Stochastic processes and their applications **20** (1985), no. 2, 247–256.

[127] J. Zhang, S.L. Steinberg, B.S. Wilson, J.M. Oliver, and L.R. Williams, *Markov random field modeling of the spatial distribution of proteins on cell membranes*, Bulletin of mathematical biology **70** (2008), no. 1, 297–321.

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332
E-mail: dgoldberg9@isye.gatech.edu